



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

8 949,138

PROPERTY OF

*The
University of
Michigan
Libraries*

1817

ARTES SCIENTIA VERITAS





Anglistische Forschungen

Herausgegeben von Dr. Johannes Hoops

Professor an der Universität Heidelberg

~~~~~ Heft 9 ~~~~~

## Chapters on English Printing, Prosody, and Pronunciation

(1550—1700)

by

Bastiaan A. P. Van Dam

and

Cornelis Stoffel



Heidelberg

Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung

1902

187

20.5  
1  
1/2

Alle Rechte, besonders das Recht der Übersetzung in fremde Sprachen,  
werden vorbehalten.

20.1  
20.2  
20.3  
20.4  
20.5  
20.6  
20.7  
20.8  
20.9  
20.10  
20.11  
20.12  
20.13  
20.14  
20.15  
20.16  
20.17  
20.18  
20.19  
20.20  
20.21  
20.22  
20.23  
20.24  
20.25  
20.26  
20.27  
20.28  
20.29  
20.30  
20.31  
20.32  
20.33  
20.34  
20.35  
20.36  
20.37  
20.38  
20.39  
20.40  
20.41  
20.42  
20.43  
20.44  
20.45  
20.46  
20.47  
20.48  
20.49  
20.50  
20.51  
20.52  
20.53  
20.54  
20.55  
20.56  
20.57  
20.58  
20.59  
20.60  
20.61  
20.62  
20.63  
20.64  
20.65  
20.66  
20.67  
20.68  
20.69  
20.70  
20.71  
20.72  
20.73  
20.74  
20.75  
20.76  
20.77  
20.78  
20.79  
20.80  
20.81  
20.82  
20.83  
20.84  
20.85  
20.86  
20.87  
20.88  
20.89  
20.90  
20.91  
20.92  
20.93  
20.94  
20.95  
20.96  
20.97  
20.98  
20.99  
20.100

## Contents.

---

|                                                                                                              | Page |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| I. High-handed Ways of Elizabethan and Jacobean Printers                                                     | 1    |
| II. The Dogma of the «Extra Syllables» in the Heroic and Blank-verse Line (XVI. and XVII. Century) . . . . . | 49   |
| III. An Inquiry into the Use of Synizesis in Shakespearean and Miltonic Verse . . . . .                      | 114  |

---

.

.

I.  
HIGH-HANDED WAYS  
OF  
ELIZABETHAN AND JACOBÆAN PRINTERS.

---

Looking away from the so-called piratical or surreptitious prints, we find that of several dramas of Shakespeare — and, indeed, also of his contemporaries — there exist different old editions of which the texts in some cases show considerable divergencies. These old editions are all of them corrupt. All textual critics are at one in the conclusion that not a single one of these first editions accurately represents the manuscript as it left Shakespeare's hands.

But the critics are not agreed as to the way in which this fact must be accounted for.

As a rule it is held that the plays used to be printed not from the author's manuscripts, but from stage-copies, in which of course various reasons rendered all kinds of alterations comprehensible, excusable, desirable, or necessary. According to the same hypothesis another part of the mistakes may with perfect safety be laid at the door of the transcriber, while the rest of them are set down to the printer's negligence and inadvertence.

Besides, a few scholars hold that in certain cases Shakespeare actually recast plays at a subsequent period. But

this supposition seems to us of too little importance to be discussed in these introductory remarks, which would run to inordinate length if we were to go about to show its lack of solid foundation for each separate case.

To the stage-copy hypothesis there are several weighty objections.

The title-page of the Hamlet quarto of 1604 expressly states that the text was printed "according to the true and perfect Coppie".

The Folio of 1623 makes the same statement.

Many of Shakespeare's plays are so long that we are fain to conclude that the corresponding stage-copies must have been much shorter than the texts that have come down to us.

It can hardly be assumed that new stage-copies were made at every turn: at the same time such assumption becomes necessary if we wish to account for the discrepancies between the different editions by supposing the latter to have been printed from stage-manuscripts.

The same categories of textual differences that are observed in the old prints of Shakespeare's works, are already met with when comparing the first (1565) and the second (1570) edition of Gorboduc, at a time, therefore, when neither theatres nor stage-copies were as yet in existence.

But the most fatal objection to the stage-copy hypothesis is after all, that no one has up to now succeeded in proving that the deviations in the various old prints were desirable, or could on rational grounds be accounted for by the requirements of theatrical performance.

Even the omissions, which in extreme cases, at least so far as we know with certainty from a comparison of two different old or first editions, when taken together never

exceed about two hundred lines in a whole play, are too insignificant to allow us to consider them as abridgments made for the purposes of stage representation.

The stage-manuscript hypothesis lacks and will always lack the only solid foundation on which it could be made to rest: a clear substantiation of the motives that could render it acceptable.

We shall now try briefly to convey an idea of the nature and the number of the textual corruptions in the old editions of Shakespeare's plays.

We may distinguish the following categories:

1° ordinary misprints, of which the number is comparatively small;

2° line-shiftings, i. e. cases in which part of a blank verse line is wrongly shifted on to the next line, or tagged to the preceding one; line-shiftings are rare in certain plays, but exceedingly frequent in others;

3° omissions, small and longer ones;

4° text-changes, in some cases extending to a very large number, but almost always of very slight importance;

5° small additions, as a rule bearing a very insignificant character, but in the case of the more remarkable among them evincing some kind of intent to elucidate the text.

Setting aside cases of punctuation, spelling differences, and the like, we estimate the textual differences between the first edition and the Folio version of Richard III to be about twelve hundred and fifty in number. About a hundred of these differences concern words which in one text are found in the singular, and in the plural number in the other. Apart from the longer omissions, speaking generally all the other variations are characterised by an utter lack of intel-

ligent purpose and significance to the ordinary reader. For in the cases in question it is absolutely immaterial to the sense to be conveyed, whether we read *bosom* or *breast*, *spy* or *see*, *this* or *the*, *you* or *thou*, etc., etc.

In the case of *Hamlet* we estimate the number of these same textual differences at about nine hundred.

If now we attempt to trace the motives that must have led to these alterations of the text, we find that one group of mistakes may be set down to inadvertence or negligence; that a second group baffles all attempts at explanation, the changes being apparently dictated by sheer caprice; and that the third group can be accounted for by assuming a desire to correct the text after a fashion. We are not aware that any of the numerous editors of Shakespeare's works has clearly realised to himself the existence of this third group. Still, this group undoubtedly exists, and it comprises an increasing number of cases at the cost of the other groups, according as we take greater pains to account to ourselves for what at first sight impresses us as motiveless caprice or inconceivable negligence. This desire to quasi-correct the text is evinced in the line-shiftings that attempt to do away with enjambments, in the endeavours to smooth out supposed metrical flaws, in the omission of obscure passages or of words and phrases that might give offence, in the toning down of strong language, in the replacing of obsolete or unusual words or constructions by common ones, in attempts at elucidating difficult passages, and at doing away with seeming contradictions, in a word in bringing the critical faculty to bear on the text in various ways. The corrections frequently impress us as attempts made by an opinionative pedant to cut down to his own taste work which was beyond his grasp.

Who were the negligent bunglers and arbitrary wiseacres who have thus been tampering with the original text?

The answer to this question is given in *William Shakespeare: Prosody and Text*<sup>1)</sup>, and to this book we must refer the reader desirous of knowing the grounds on which we conclude that all the disfigurements of the text are owing to the manner in which books were wont to be printed in England in the reigns of Elizabeth and James I. It was by no means a fixed custom that the author of a work was aware of its being brought out in print, or had a hand in its being printed and published. Even in cases in which he was allowed a share in the correction of the printing-proofs, he frequently had no more than an advisory voice. Shakespeare has most certainly not had the proofs of his printed plays submitted to his revisal, and . . . at the same time there is not the slightest reason to assume that they have not been printed from the original manuscripts.

We cannot here restate the arguments which in their totality bear out our answer to the question, or once more attempt to vindicate the correctness of our new solution of the mystery. We only wish to avail ourselves of this opportunity to adduce fresh evidence for illustrating two points of pre-eminent importance.

The stage-manuscript theory becomes of course altogether untenable if we can successfully show that the same arbitrary textual differences which the said theory is so often called in to account for, are found in all sorts of Elizabethan books that have absolutely nothing to do with the stage.

---

<sup>1)</sup> *William Shakespeare: Prosody and Text. An Essay in criticism, being an introduction to a better editing and a more adequate appreciation of the works of the Elizabethan poets.* By B. A. P. van Dam, M. D., with the assistance of C. Stoffel. Leyden, Late E. J. Brill. 1900.

Now, in all kinds of printed poetry, in Shakespeare's Sonnets, in Spenser's, in Sylvester's, and in Sir John Davies's works, are found a small number of what we shall call non-rhymes, i. e. lines of poetry that do not constitute rhymes, but ought to do so, because all other similarly circumstanced lines do. And the most curious thing about the matter in all these cases is, that the genuine rhyme-word which the poet *must* necessarily have used, is one that directly suggests itself to the reader, and most frequently a synonym of the final word of one of the non-rhyming lines. As a rule the two synonyms are differentiated by the printed word being a more common, and the omitted word a comparatively rare one.

Since such *non-rhymes* are often met with in absolutely non-dramatic texts, and also in cases in which there is not the slightest reason for assuming the intermediary of a transcriber<sup>1)</sup>, the only possible explanation of this highly remarkable fact is that the corruption of the text took place in the printing-office. The printers or correctors were in the habit of correcting the author's work according to their own taste or caprice. Not but that they knew a rhyme when they saw one, but their inveterate habit of making alterations made them forget in a few cases that, whatever they did, they ought at least to leave the rhymes intact.

Of course we are also necessarily led to conclude that all works in which *non-rhymes* are found cannot have been corrected by the author himself — a conclusion which is in every case confirmed by other facts and considerations.

To exemplify the occurrence of these *non-rhymes* we

<sup>1)</sup> For example in Edmund Spenser's *Faerie Queene*, that poem of portentous length, which was successively issued in two instalments by the same publisher.

subjoin a few instances which we have not given in William Shakespeare: Prosody and Text.

Lines 205—208 of *The Passionate Pilgrim* stand thus in the first Quarto of 1599:

Were I with her, the night would past too soone,  
But now are minutes added to the houres:  
To spite me now, ech minute seemes an houre,  
Yet not for me, shine sun to succour flowers.

Since in each of the two preceding stanzas of this poem, the third line rhymes with the first, Malone has very judiciously changed *an houre* into *a moon*. Malone's emendation is the less open to doubt as the final words of the second and the third line *houres* and *houre* constitute a decided cacophony.

Stanza 29, Canto 8, Book II of Spenser's *Faerie Queene* stands thus in the first edition:

Indeed then said the Prince the euill donne  
Dyes not, when breath the body first doth leaue,  
But from the grandsyre to the Nephewes sonne,  
And all his seede the curse doth often cleaue.  
Till vengeance vtterly the guilt bereaue:  
So streightly God doth iudge. But gentle knight,  
That doth against the dead his hand vpreare,  
His honour staines with rancour and despight,  
And great disparagment makes to his former might.

The requirements of Spenser's rhyme-system show that the poet must have written *upheave* instead of *uprear* in the seventh line of this stanza.

The first seven lines of Stanza 11 of the prologue to the fifth book of the *Faerie Queene* are printed as follows in the editio princeps:

Dread Souerayne Goddess, that doest highest sit  
In seate of iudgement, in th' Almightyes place,

And with magnificke might and wondrous wit  
 Doest to thy people righteous doome aread,  
 That furthest Nations filles with awfull dread,  
 Pardon the boldnesse of thy basest thrall,  
 That dare discourse of so diuine a read.

Since the second line must rhyme with the fourth, the fifth, and the seventh, Spenser must have written *stead* instead of *place* at the end of it. The correction was indeed made already in the Folio of 1609.

Lines 5—8 of the ninth Sonnet of Spenser's Ruines of Rome stand thus in the old editions:

Why haue your hands long sithence traueiled  
 To frame this world, that doth endure so long?  
 Or why were not these Romane palaces  
 Made of some matter no lesse firme and strong?<sup>1)</sup>

Since the first and the third of these lines must rhyme, Morris in the Globe Spenser surmises that instead of *palaces* Spenser has written *p'laces failed* in the third line. Such a supposition is, however, out of the question: *faïléd* cannot possibly form a rhyme with *trávüiléd*.

Morris's idea about the nature of the mistake may, however, well be right. In that case we may suppose Spenser to have written *palaces sped*, *palaces* of course to be syncopated to *p'laces* according to the well-known Elizabethan practice, which we also find exemplified in Spenser's Teares of the Muses, 580:

Live she for ever, and her royall p'laces  
 Be fild with praises of divinest wits,

*Sped* in the sense of 'ruined' was not uncommon in Elizabethan English.

<sup>1)</sup> Pourquoi iadis ont trauaillé voz mains  
 A façonner ce monde qui tant dure?  
 Ou que ne fut de matiere aussi dure  
 Le braue front de ces palais Romains?  
 Les Regrets, etc. de L. du Bellay. 1568. p. 54 bis.

Still, it seems more probable to us, after all, that Spenser in translating du Bellay's lines did not use the word *sped*, which at best would have been only a stop-gap, but that his words were:

Or why were not these Romane p'laces made  
Of some such matter no lesse firme and strong?

The translation is better in this way, and as regards the rhyme *-ed: made*, various analogies might be cited from which it may be inferred that the pronunciation *med* for *made* was admissible in Spenser's time.

On p. 165 of Arber's reprint of the first edition (1590) of *An Eglogve Vpon the death of the R. H. Sir Francis Walsingham* by Thomas Watson, we have the four lines following:

O heards and tender flocks, ô handsmooth plains,  
ô Eccho dwelling both in mount and vallie:  
O groues and bubling springs, ô nymphs, ô swains,  
ô yong and olde, ô weepe all Arcadie.

As the second and the fourth of the lines cited must rhyme, it is evident that Watson did not write *mount and vallie*, but *mount and lea*.

On p. 196 of Arber's reprint of Watson, *The Tears of Fancie*. Or, *Loue Disdained*, 1593, lines 5—8 of the 36th Sonnet run as follows:

My voice is like ynto the raging wind,  
Which roareth still and neuer is at rest:  
The diuers thoughts that tumble in my minde,  
Are restlesse like the wheele that wherles away.

Since, according to Watson's rhyme-system in these sonnets, the second of the lines cited must form a rhyme with the fourth, Watson must have written *at stay*, and not *at rest*.

On p. 13 of *The Whole Works of Homer*; . . . trans-

lated . . . . by Geo: Chapman. At London printed for Nathaniell Butter. [1616], we read:

. . . . . tis a thing  
Honest, and honourd too. to heare one sing  
Numbers so like the Gods in elegance,  
As this man flowes in. By the mornes first light,<sup>1)</sup>

Of course, Chapman wrote *glance* instead of *light*. There is another instance in p. 13 of *The Georgicks of Hesiod, By George Chapman; . . . London . . . 1618*.

Iustice is seed to Ioue; in all fame deare,  
And reuerend to the Gods. inhabiting Heauen;  
And still a Virgin; whom when Men ill giuen,  
Hurt, and abhorring from the right, shall wrong;  
She for redresse; to Ioue her sire complaines,  
Of the vniust minde, every man sustaines;  
And prays the people may repay the paines  
Their Kings haue forfeited, in their offences;  
Deprauing Iustice, and the genuine senses,  
Of lawes corrupted. in their sentences.<sup>2)</sup>

It stands to reason that in the fourth line of the passage quoted Chapman had written *shall raven*, which the printer thought fit to replace by *shall wrong*.

This last quotation from Chapman is eminently instructive, for, besides exhibiting the peculiar views of the printers with regard to punctuation, a subject which authors were apt

<sup>1)</sup> . . . ἐπεὶ το γέ καλὸν ἀκούμεν' ἰστὶν ᾠδοῦ  
τοιοῦδ'. οἷος ὅδ' ἰστί, θεοῖσ' ἐναλίγκιος ἀνδρῖν.  
ἰὼθεν . . .

ΟΛΥΣΣΕΙΑΣ α. 370—372.

<sup>2)</sup> Ἢ δέ τε παρθένος ἐστὶ Λικη, Λιδὸς ἐκγεγεννη,  
κνυρὴ τ' αἰδοίη τε θεοῖς οἱ Ὀλυμπιον ἔχουσιν.  
Καὶ ᾧ' ὅπστ' ἄν τις μιν βλάβητι, ἀκολιῶς ὀνοτάζων,  
αὐτίκα παρ Λιδὶ πατρὶ καθεζομένη Κρονίῳ  
γῆρετ' ἀνθρώπων ἄδικον νόον ὕψ' ἀποτίσῃ  
δῆμος ἀτασθαλίας φαιλέων, οἳ λυγρὰ ροεῖντες  
ἄλλῃ παρῳκλίνωσι δίκας ἀκολιῶς ἐνέποντες.

ΕΡΓΑ ΚΑΙ ΗΜΕΡΑΙ, 256—262.

utterly to disregard, it furnishes in its concluding line a striking example of the way in which metrically correct lines often came to grief in the process of being set up in type.

For it is plain that *sénsēs* and *séntencés* do not constitute a rhyme, although some philologists — as we have seen on p. 8, Morris is among their number —, led astray by such cases as the one here referred to, and by other more or less analogous ones, generally take for granted that older English poets actually meant such impossibilities to do duty as rhymes. *Sénsés* rhymes with *séntencés*, and Chapman uses the latter word with the obsolete French accentuation. It follows that a word has dropped out from the line. This conclusion is confirmed by the obscurity of the English text as it stands, an obscurity that would become considerably less if in the last lines there were question not of *sentences* or *judgments* in general, but of *strained judgments*. If now we consult the Greek original we actually find that the word *σκολιῶς* has no English equivalent. Consequently Chapman must have written:

Of lawes, corrupted in their writhd sentences.

But it should by no means be imagined that the omission of *writh'd* (or perhaps of a synonymous word, *e. g.* *wrung*, *wrong*, or *strain'd*) is a case of inadvertence on the printer's part in this instance. The word was deleted of set purpose, and the deletion constitutes a quasi-correction of the metre, for the corrector pronounced the word *sentences* with the modern accent, which was the more usual one already in his time. There can be little doubt that this mode of accounting for the irregularity is in accordance with the facts, for once the existence of these quasi-corrections being known, they indeed crop up everywhere. Thus, for instance, Shakespeare wrote:

And I nothing to backe my suite at all,

R. III. I 2, 236 Q.

But the Folio corrector, who pronounced *nothing* instead of *nothing*, changed the blank verse line to

And I, no Friends to backe my suite withall,

an alteration which the context shows to be anything but an improvement.

As we have before observed, and illustrated by examples, the same arbitrary textual changes which the stage-copy theory is alleged to account for, occur in all kinds of books absolutely unconnected with the stage, and in the case of some of which no transcriber can have lent his much abused services.

Thus we meet with them in places where we should hardly look for them, for example, in a dictionary of the year 1570, of which the title runs as follows: *Manipulus Vocabulorum. A Dictionarie of English and Latine wordes, set forth in suche order, as none heretofore hath ben, the Englishe going before the Latine. necessary not onely for Scholers that want varietie of words, but also for such as use to write in English Meetre. Gathered and set forth by P. Leuins, Anno 1570. For the better understanding of the order of this present Dictionarie, read ouer the Preface to the Reader, and the Epistle Dedicatorie, and thou shalt finde it easie and plaine, and further thereof thou shalt gather great profite. Imprinted at London by Henrie Bynneman, for John Waley.*

This book has been reprinted by *The Early English Text Society* in 1867, under the editorship of Henry B. Wheatley, and it is from this edition that our quotations will be made.

The work is known as the first "Rhyming Dictionary", but this description may lead the student astray, since to be of use to versifiers was only a secondary object with the

compiler of the *Manipulus*. It contains a large number of words that have no corresponding rhyme-words to keep them in countenance, and the chief aim of the author was to give a cheap school-book to be used in the teaching of English and Latin.

Levins has arranged his English words according to the vowel or the diphthong in the last syllable. He thus gets nine main groups in the order *a, e, i, o, u, ay, ea, oy, and ou*. In each of these main groups the words are alphabetically arranged according to the consonant or consonants that follows or follow the said vowel or diphthong. The disposition of the sixth main group, for instance, begins as follows:

(column 196) *In aye desinentia.*

*In ay.*

A DAY, *dies, ei.*

etc.

(col. 197) *Ay ante D.*

*In ay d.*

AYD, *auxilium, praesidium.*

etc.

*In ayge.*

A GAYGE, *pignus, oris, hoc.*

etc.

(col. 198) *In eyghe.*

to WEYGHE, *ponderare.*

etc.

*In eyght.*

EYGHT, *octo.*

etc.

*Ay ante K.*

*In ayke.*

A LAYKE, *play, ludus, i.*

etc.

*Ay ante L.*

*In ayle.*

A BAYLE, *vadimonium, i.*

etc.

From this partial transcription of a couple of columns of the *Manipulus* we see that the superscription "Ay ante G" has dropped out. Such omissions of superscriptions occur repeatedly, and account, for instance, for the fact that in col. 141 the word *Eclipse* figures as the last in the list of the words "In iple". The passage cited further shows that words spelled with *ey* are classed under the *ay*-group, so that we are justified in the surmise that Levins's arrangement does not strictly conform to the spelling of the words, but is to some extent influenced by their pronunciation. We shall afterwards see that this actually proves to be the case also in other respects. In flat contradiction to the systematic arrangement adopted by Levins, we find in col. 125, among the words "In il":

A LADIL, *rubicula, æ.*

LÉNTIL. *lens, entis, hæc.*

LYNTIL of a cart. *radius, i.*

A PIN, *penis, is, hic.*

ye MAYSILLES <sup>1)</sup>. *variola, arum.*

A MANTILL, *gausape, is, hoc.*

And in col. 196, among the words "In ay":

A DAY, *dies, ei.*

TO DÁY, *hodiè.*

TO MÓROW, *cras.*

YÉSTERDAY, *heri.*

EUERYDAY, *quotidiè.*

Here are two cases that constitute perfect analogues to *non-rhymes* in a poem of regularly recurring rhyming lines. The solution of the mystery is, of course, that Levins wrote in his manuscript *pizzil* (= pizzle) instead of *pin*, and *next day*, or perhaps *morow day*, instead of *to morow* <sup>2)</sup>.

--- --

<sup>1)</sup> Plurals are in Levins's system invariably placed as if they were in the singular.

<sup>2)</sup> *To morowe* also figures in col. 181, where it is in its proper place.

These two arbitrary alterations of the text, which plainly announce themselves as having been dictated by a desire to introduce corrections, must have originated with the printer. For we may in this case safely set aside the notorious hypothetical transcriber, the only intermediate party that can at all be thought of.

Not only that the nature of the book evidently excludes the likelihood of any "scribal" agency, Levins himself explicitly states in his dedicatory epistle *to the right worshipful M. Stanley*, that from the time he began to work at his book, it has been his intent *to publishe and set abroade the same*. There can therefore be hardly any doubt that Levins personally handed over his own work to the printer.

From the occurrence of these two arbitrary corruptions of the text it is plain also in this case that Levins himself cannot have corrected the proofs of his book. We think it as impossible for Levins to have failed to notice these strongly marked infringements of his system of arrangement, as for a poet to overlook *non-rhymes* in the correction of the proof-sheets of his work. Besides, the conclusion we have come to is confirmed by other considerations.

Wheatley, who has bestowed great care on his edition of the book, has, among other addenda, appended to it a list of all the Latin words which in his opinion are disfigured by indubitable misprints. These misprints amount to about three hundred and fifty on a total of about nine thousand Latin words. Compared with this number, evident misprints in the English words are very rare indeed. We may take for granted that Levins could spell Latin as correctly as he could English. How then, we may ask, could this enormous difference have arisen, if Levins himself had seen to the correction of the proofs? This enormous dif-

ference is, of course, accounted for by the circumstance that Levins had nothing to say to the printing of his own book, and that the printer, who perhaps, and even probably, was his own corrector, was on easier terms with English than he was with Latin.

We have taken the trouble of subjecting these 350 misprints to a somewhat close scrutiny, and have arrived at the apparently startling, but in reality easily explainable conclusion that the great majority of these misprints would cease to be mistakes, if there was question of printing English words. The licence then prevailing in English spelling has by the printer been extended to the spelling of Latin. We shall give a handful of examples by way of illustration. Doubling of a consonant, or printing one consonant instead of two identical ones, widely spread practices in the English spelling of the time, we find, for instance, in *legittimus* (col. 207) and *aparitor* (col. 160). The uncertainty about the *r*, as regards omission, intrusion, and transposal, we see in *purigo* (col. 150), *fragrum* (col. 106), and *scortum* for *scrotum* (col. 155). The customary confusion between *m* and *n* (cf. the English rhymes of vowel + *m* and vowel + *n*), the interchange of *c* and *t*, as in *nacion*, *nation*, but also the less frequent confusion of *c* and *g*, as in *criple*, *griple*, are found, for instance, in *epistonium* (col. 177), *gramum* (col. 26), *commertium* (col. 224), *gracia* (col. 6), *cumphus* (col. 85), and *gratire* (col. 38). The omission and insertion of vowels in certain positions, as in *beautous*, *jealous*, are seen, for example, in *dolum* (col. 181) and *modestius* (col. 92). Interchange of *æ* and *e* occurs sixty times, and we think Wheatley goes too far in classing all these cases as indubitable misprints. In Elizabethan spelling *æ* and *e*, and other pairs of vowels, are frequently made to

interchange: we find eighteen times *e* for *i*, sixteen cases of *i* for *e*, etc., etc. What we have here set before us is not Levins's Latin, but Latin according to the views of the printing-office, spelt on the principles to which English was made to conform there.

Besides, there are still other facts whose joint significance tends to corroborate the conclusion that Levins himself cannot have had the proof-sheets of his work submitted to him for revisal. The series of words "E ante S" is in col. 85 broken into by a number of words that ought to have been placed further on. After to *Expresse*, *exprimere* we read "Loke for mo words of E ante S, and E ante T, after E ante V". And when the "E ante V" words are done with, we read in col. 90 "Here folowe certaine words omitted before of E ante S, and E ante T".

Has Levins, we may ask, or has the printer forgotten to assign their proper place to these stragglers?

Of course the fault lies with the printer, and it is the printer also and not Levins himself, who has inserted the directions to the reader just given.

If these directions had originated with Levins himself, he would have meant them as directions to the printer, and besides this, he would have pointed out to the printer, for each of these two different omitted groups of words separately, the place where it ought to be inserted. If Levins had inadvertently omitted the words, they would fit in individually or in small groups among the words given previously, but it so happens that all the omitted vocables with the ending *-esse* in due order join company with the series interrupted at the word to *Expresse*. The omitted words *E ante T* are in exactly the same case, for in strict accordance with Levins's system the words *Manchet*, etc. in col. 93 would have

had their proper place after the rhymes *A Mallet, A Wallet* in col. 88.

These wholesale interruptions now may be accounted for in a very simple way. The loose sheets of Levins's manuscript had got out of order, and when the printer became aware of his mistake, he thought it needless to put himself to greater inconvenience, and merely inserted the directions to the reader which we have cited.

Exactly the same mistake occurs in another place, but in this case without any attempt at rectification on the printer's part. In col. 83, after *to Reserue*, we find, without any break or warning, a long succession of words ending in *-er*. If all these words in the order in which they are found printed there, are inserted between *Warreyner* and *Alabaster* in col. 80, or after *A Philosopher* in col. 81, the systematical order is set right. We mention two possible places for the words referred to, because Levins's arrangement of the words in each closing section is subject to certain exceptions, but since the order of the words in the subsections does not affect our argument, we shall not enter into these deviations from the system adopted.

On the other hand, we must not omit to reckon with Wheatley's general objections to Levins's arrangement of his words, because according to Wheatley's mode of putting the matter the reader might easily get the impression that the order of the words in the *Manipulus* is wholly devoid of system, and that consequently our conclusion drawn from the two arbitrary alterations of the text which we have pointed out, might be equally without legitimate foundation.

In his *Preface*, p. V. Wheatley says:

The *Manipulus* is arranged according to the order of the vowels and diphthongs, but in many instances the order has

been broken into. The following are some of the misplacements: — At the end of the words under the heading *ede* (col. 52) are *breadth* and *bedle*; under *em* (59) are *hempe*, *kembe*, *temple*, *tremble*, etc.; in the middle of the words under *ent*, *building* has crept in (67. 25); under *erve* (83) some words ending in *er* are inserted, and also *unsure*; under *tie* (108) is *flye*; under *ip* (141) is *Egypt*; under *out* (167) is *a mouth*; under *orl* (171) is *world*; under *oste* (175) is *apostle*; under *ungue* (189) is *bungle*; under *eague* (206) is *beagle*; under *sweame* (208) is *neamble*; under *east* (212) is *leashe*. — The words [in] *ed* (48) and *er* (70) are mixed up in a very unsystematic manner. Besides these and other incongruities, several words are repeated under slightly different headings: thus many words under *il* (123—29) are repeated under *able*, *ottle*, etc. At col. 115 are four words under *ict*, and at col. 122 are four words under *ickt*.

What, we may ask, is the value and the significance of these strictures?

*Breadth* under the words “in *ede* or *eed*” need not be a case of misplacement, if it can be proved that in Levins’s time the pronunciation or the dropping of *th* at the end of this word was left to the speaker’s option.

The dropping of *th* at the end of a word was very common in Elizabethan pronunciation.

In the old prints we now and then find *wi’* for *with*, the abbreviation being still in common use in Scotch; and the references and quotations following exemplify a number also of other cases:

*notwithstanding* M. N. D. III 2, 394 (Quarto<sup>1</sup> III 2, 407);  
God *bwy* you H 5. V 1, 70 (Spurious Quarto); *thousand*  
As IV 1, 46 (Folio 1623); *twelfe* Tw. N. II 3, 90 (Ibid.).

And plot *wi’* my learn’d Counsell, Master Picklocke,

*Ben Jonson*, *Newes*, 1631, p. 61.

My liege, *quo’* the abbot, I would it were knowne.

*Percy’s Reliques*, 1845, p. 168.

As concernynge thys matter we haue playne commaundemente  
in the *fyftene* of Deutro.

*Th. Lever*, *Sermons*, 1550 (Repr. *Arber*, p. 44).

. . . , I preaching at Paules Crosse the fowertene day of  
December last past, . . .

*Id. ibid.* (Repr. Arber, p. 100).

. . . in the twentie and seuen Chapter of Hieremye.

*Id. ibid.* (Repr. Arber, p. 36).

Richard Hodges, "a School-Master", in his booklet "A special help to Orthographie: *etc.* London, printed for Richard Cotes. 1643" (Ellis, Early English Pronunciation, Part. IV, pp. 1018—1023), gives a list of words "so neer alike in sound, as that they are sometimes taken one for another", and among these words we find "myrrhe, mirth" <sup>1)</sup>, and "tens, tense, tents, tenths".

In "English Orthographie or The Art of right spelling, reading, pronouncing, and writing all sorts of English Words. Wherein such, as, *etc.* . . . Together with The difference between words of like sound, *etc.*" (Ellis. l. c., pp. 1024—1028), brought out at Oxford in 1668, without the author's name [Owen Price?], there is a "Table of the difference between Words of Like Sound", from which we cite the following: "*hy* to make hast, *hay*, *high*, *highth* loftiness, highness".

In Th. Dekker we lately came upon the following instance (Pearson's Reprint, vol. III, p. 293):

*Nar.* How blowes the winde Syr?

*Seaf.*

Wynde! is Nore-Nore-West.

---

<sup>1)</sup> In Thomas Watson's *The Tears of Fancie*, 1593, Sonnet 27 (Repr. Arber, p. 192), ll. 9—14 run as follows:

And euerie tree forbeareth to let fall,  
Their dewie drops mongst any brinish teares:  
Onelie the mirth whose hart as mine is thrall,  
To melt in sorrowes source no whit forbear[s].  
So franticke loue with grieve our paind harts wringing,  
That still we wept and still the grasse was springing.

In a note to line 11 Prof. Arber suggests that the word *mirth* stands for *myrrh*. We have no doubt that Arber is right, and that Watson is alluding to the tragical story of Cinyras and his daughter Myrrha, the victim of "franticke love", and changed into a myrrh-tree. See Book X of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*.

This curtailed pronunciation of the word *north* is found attested to as late as 1704 on p. 78 of *The New Art of Spelling. Design'd etc.* By J. Jones, M. D. London, Printed in the Year 1704 (first edition 1701). But Dr. Jones adds that it was so pronounced "by Seamen". Indeed, sailors of our day continue to use the forms *sourest*, *souvester*, which may also be instanced, for example, from Lowell's *Biglow Papers*<sup>1</sup>). Now vulgar or class pronunciations of our time as a rule represent current pronunciations of a bygone age, and our view as regards the optional dropping of final *th* certainly receives strong confirmation from the fact that in Queen Elizabeth's own handwriting we find the form *er* to represent the word *earth*:

For the bent of eche fortune helpes or throwes to *er*,  
*Queen Elizabeth's Englishings*, p. 146<sup>2</sup>).

In another manuscript written by the Queen's own hand we find the word *strength* written without *th* seven times, viz. three times on p. 5, and further on pp. 30, 84, 113, and 143; *lengh(e)* to represent *length* on pp. 36 and 136; while on p. 115 we come upon the spelling "bredhth" for *breadth*, and on p. 108, in the handwriting of the Queen's clerk, Thomas Windebank, upon the form "strenght". These spellings show that there was uncertainty as regards the proper orthography, either because in these words it was left to the speaker's option to pronounce the final *th* or to drop it; or because in the words in question the pronunciation with-

---

<sup>1</sup>) Only the other day *The Academy* cited from a contemporary a statement about a workman studiously inclined, to the effect that "he would argue by the hour on the subject of Hamlet's 'nor nor-west' madness", etc. (*Academy*, Nov. 30, 1901, 497<sup>a</sup>).

<sup>2</sup>) *London: Publisht for the Early English Text Society, etc. 1899. Original Series, 113.*

out *th* was the normal one, and could therefore be no guide to their spelling.

Now it is certainly true that, unlike most of the other instances, the form *lengh* may be considered as an archaism, since it may represent Old English *lengu*, and by the side of its synonym *length*, representing Old English *lengd*, may be looked upon as an independent word-form. This, however, is a matter of purely academical interest, because three hundred years ago even cultured speakers knew little or nothing of questions of word-history or etymology, and without the least doubt looked at the matter from the practical point of view only, the confusion prevailing in their minds being strikingly shadowed forth in such spellings as *bredlith* and *strenght*.

But if there is one word in *-th* of which we may take for granted that in 1570 this *th* might be sounded or dropped at the speaker's option, it is undoubtedly the word *breadth*, seeing that, so far as we know, in its case the spelling with *th* cannot be traced farther back than 1523, the date of Murray's oldest example. Chaucer knows the form *brede* only, while at the same time he uses not *lenghe* but *lengthe*. The date of Mätzner's latest example of the form *lenghe* is about 1430. We now find Queen Elizabeth using *lenghe* as late as 1593 and 1598, from which we may safely conclude that *brede* cannot have been out of use in 1570, the date of the *Manipulus*.

The occurrence of *breadth* among the words ending in *e* or *ee* does not therefore justify the conclusion that the order has been broken into, but, viewed in connexion with what we have said before and shall adduce further on, must lead us to infer that Levins's system of arranging his

words is based, not only on their spelling, but to a certain extent also on their pronunciation.

Under the ending *ede* or *eed* we also find the word *bedle*. Exactly on a par with this is the place assigned to the words *temple*, *tremble*, *apostle*, *bungle*, *beagle*, and *neamble*. Besides these deviations referred to by Wheatley, there are many other words, all of them ending in "syllabic *l*", which are arranged according to the vowel or diphthong in the *penultimate syllable*. In this instance, therefore, we have to deal with a deviation on principle from Levins's system, a deviation that occurs all through the book. But, we may ask, where was Levins to place these words? Not under those ending in *e*. For the printed *e* at the end of these words is absolutely silent as such, and cannot therefore come into consideration in any arrangement on the basis of the last syllable. To class them with the words ending in *-el*, would be somewhat better. But if we thus assign places to them on the basis of their pronunciation, we may with almost equal justice put them under the terminations *al*, *il*, or *ul*. And in accordance with this we actually find that Levins has inserted the word *table* or *tabil*, for instance, both under *able* (col. 1), and under *il* (col. 126).

It is well-known that in his time there was no generally recognised spelling, the greatest latitude being allowed writers and printers as to the mode of figuring sounds by the letters at their disposal.

Especially as regards this so-called "syllabic *l*" ending, Levins therefore found himself confronted by a great difficulty, for which it was almost impossible for him to find a consistent solution. He inserted a large number of the words in question under the ending *il*. but if he had placed there all the words ending in "syllabic *l*", he would have had to

give them a spelling which most of his contemporaries must have objected to. This was therefore probably the reason why he arranged the other words in *le* on the basis of their last accented syllable, so that they are found sprinkled over the whole of his book: *ludle*, etc. figure under *ade*, *magyle* under *agge*, *ankle*, etc. under *anke*, etc. In col. 129 he sounds a warning note on this point, and in conclusion says: *Wherfore, if ye fynd not in the one of these, seeke in the other and yee shal not misse.*

We may just add that the only other termination that presents similar difficulties, is the ending *re*, e. g. in *lucre*, which Levins gives in the spelling *luker*. But no one could object to these words figuring with the spelling *er*.

At bottom therefore, also in this case again, it is the conflicting claims of spelling and pronunciation that have given rise to the deviations referred to.

The insertion of the words *hempe* and *kembe* (*temple* and *tremble*) under the ending *em* is not an infringement of the system, but must be accounted for by the dropping of *p* and *b* in pronunciation, a dropping that is the rule even now in well-nigh all the words ending in *mb*. In col. 131 Levins puts "A Limbe" under the words "In *im*", and in col. 188 "Dumbe" under the words "In *um*". We are somewhat surprised to find Wheatley passing over the word *to Tempt*, which is printed under the ending *em*, and which of course was sounded *tem*.

To prove that the *p* was not pronounced in *tempt*, we refer the reader to Dr. Jones, who says on p. 74 that *p* is silent in all words in the collocation *mpt*, and cite the following rhyme to show that this pronunciation was equally current a century earlier:

Yet to encounter this your weake attempt,  
Behold an Army comes incontinent.

*Marlowe* (?), *Faustus*, 1616, ll. 1467 and 1468.

It is well-known that *m : n* does not interfere with the rhyme, because in Elizabethan pronunciation *n* was generally pronounced as *m*.

That the final *t* of *tempt* might be dropped in pronunciation we see from the following rhyme :

And though she were of rigid temper,  
With melting flames accost, and tempt her :

*Butler*, *Hudibras*, II Part, 1664. p. 28;

and from such phonetic spellings as

In furthering these attempts

*Dickers and Webster*, Sir Thomas Wyat, 1607.

Repr. Pearson, Vol. III, p. 90.

Some thought to thanke th' attempt. He did presume,

*Ben Jonson*, *Assc*, Second Folio, vol. II, p. 116.

- See also pp. 27 ff. as regards the dropping of final *t*.

In the following subsection of the *Manipulus to Exempt* figures under the ending *eme*, because it was pronounced *exeem*.

A peculiar interest attaches to the occurrence of the word *building* under the ending *ent*. The text stands thus in col. 67 :

AN ADUISEMENT, *deliberatio*.

ye BATILMENTS, *mina, arum*.

A BUILDING, *antw, arum*.

ye ELEMENT, *elementum*.

Of course the printer is in fault also in this case. But what can Levins have written originally? Instead of *building*, we expect a word of three syllables ending in *ent*, fitting in alphabetically between *Bat-* and *El-*, quite possibly synonymous with *building*, and admitting of translation into Latin by the word *antw*. Another may be more fortunate

than ourselves, but we at least have not succeeded in reading the riddle with absolute certainty.

Perhaps the following solution, which assumes inadvertence on the printer's part, has the greatest chances of coming near the mark.

We suspect that Levins wrote

ye CONFRONTMENT of a building. *antæ, arum.*

The weak point about this solution is the translation of *Confrontment*, which is far from faultless. Still, we do not think it an impossible translation on Levins's part: imperfect translations there are several in the *Manipulus*, as, indeed, in all dictionaries. Our hypothesis is, then, that the printer has missed out the words *ye Confrontment of*. From the "fautes escaped" we see that the printer had omitted several words, and the cases there mentioned of course concern those only that had attracted attention. But there is more to be said in favour of our supposition. If the word *confrontment* ought to have stood here, a preceding line must also have been omitted in which this word occurred in its primary acceptation. It may therefore readily be supposed that in his manuscript Levins indicated the word from the preceding line by a couple of "quotes" only, and that as a matter of fact the line of the "copy" before the printer in which the word *antæ* was mentioned, contained no letters beyond those which he set up in type. That the printer's attention to his work was far from close in this place, is proved by what happened to him three lines further on, where *en Oyntment* stands for *An Enoyntment*. And that the solution suggested by us is by no means an impossible one, may be seen from the following passage in col. 117:

A DRIFT of snow, *cumulus, li.*

ye DRIFT of a matter, *actio, scopus.*

A DRIFT of cattell, *acumen*, *inis*, *hoc*, *pecus*, *òris*, *hoc*.

A DRIFT, betle, *fistuca*, *æ*.

Of course the word *acumen* constitutes a *contresens* here, but if we keep in mind that it may mean the point of an anecdote, the solution of the difficulty is simple enough. Half-way between the four lines cited, the printer has missed out

y<sup>e</sup> DRIFT of a story, *acumen*, *inis*, *hoc*.

The occurrence of the *er* words under the ending *erve* has already been discussed on p. 18; the occurrence of *unsure* among the trisyllabic *er* words is satisfactorily accounted for by the pronunciation *unsuër*, a fact which has long been known, and which Wheatley ought to have been aware of.

That the word *flye* is cited under the ending *tye* undoubtedly constitutes an infringement of the system adopted by Levins, and here Wheatley is certainly right. The mistake must necessarily have originated with Levins himself, and need not cause any great surprise to the student.

The occurrence of the word *Egipt* under the ending *ip* is accounted for by the optional dropping of this final *t* in pronunciation.

Dr. Jones l. c. says on p. 90 that the pronunciation of *t* in words ending in *pt* was optional in his time. That this rule was in force also a hundred years before the date of Dr. Jones's book is proved, for instance, by the following rhyme:

When th' other Beldamme, great with chat (for talkative be Cups)  
The formers Prate, not worth the while, thus fondly interrupts.

W. Warner, Albions England, 1597, p. 221.

But the dropping of *t* in pronunciation was by no means dependent on its being preceded by *p*. For numerous other examples we must refer the reader to pp. 81—84 of Prosody

and Text. Up to now this dropping of *t* in pronunciation has remained completely unnoticed by English philologists. If in the old texts they meet with a word in phonetic spelling, in which according to their mode of looking at the matter a letter is wanting, they conclude that they have to do with a misprint. If they come upon a rhyme, in which there is a seemingly redundant consonant, they never think of the possibility of this consonant having been silent in the pronunciation of the time, but prefer to endorse A. J. Ellis's dictum that in Shakespeare's time "we have entirely left the region of perfect rhymes".

In Shakespeare's II H 6, IV 7, 32 there occurs a pun which hinges on the dropping of *t* in the pronunciation of the word *présents*, and in the first Folio this *t* is found actually omitted in print.

On this point A. J. Ellis says: "This cannot be relied on for indicating the habitual omission of *t* in the first word; the joke is one of Jack Cade's". Since of course the great majority of verbal "jokes" are assigned to persons of the lower ranks, English philologists have thus an excellent pretext furnished them to excuse their disregarding puns as material for scholarly investigation.

As more especially concerns this *t* in *présents*, Dr. Jones says on p. 51 that the words in *ents* may drop the *t* in pronunciation.

The Richard Hodges, from whose spelling-book we have quoted on p. 20, gives "presence, presents" in the list of homonymous words there described; and on p. 28 of his book Dr. Jones observes: "*d* and *t* are very apt to be silent between two consonants". That a hundred years before his time this was just as true, is proved by upwards of a hundred rhymes used by Joshua Sylvester, of which a few have

been cited by us in Prosody and Text. And as regards the plea that such divergent pronunciations were confined to vulgar or underbred speakers, we would urge: 1° that Dr. Jones's book was "Design'd more especially for the Vse and Ease of the Duke of Glocester", as we read in the title-page of the 1701 edition; 2° that the rhymes which prove the divergent pronunciations occur in nearly *all* the poets of the Elizabethan, Jacobean and Caroline ages; and 3° that Queen Elizabeth's own writings show phonetic spellings bearing a strong evidential character on this point.

We cite from the Queen's own manuscript the following cases of dropped final *t*:

Right wel shalt do if theatur thou do pas wher pleasant  
*ough* is plaid,

Queen Elizabeth's Englishings, p. 137.

The form *ough* occurs once more on p. 145.

And if thou *Cans* not rule the so, arise and go thi way.

*Ibidem*, p. 137.

Al *deligh* hathe this with hit,

*Ib.*, p. 55.

So to our selues we bride an air clear a *Ligh* and brethe  
ful pur.

*Ib.*, p. 122.

Hope thou *naugh* ne feare,

*Ib.*, p. 7.

The form *naugh* frequently occurs, viz. on pp. 26, 122, 24, twice on p. 128, 131, 135, and 146.

Lest stranger *migh* the huswife in her house surprise,

*Ib.*, p. 125.

The form *migh* also occurs on pp. 42 and 136.

*Righ* wel applied is that the Egiptian said to him that axed,

*Ib.* p. 125.

How *righlar* he, that fondly naught doth vndertake? [*righlar*  
represents the current pronunciation of *rightlier*.]

*Ib.* p. 144.

*Rightly* sayd Philippides the poete, to Lisimachus who axed.

*Ib.*, p. 126.

If met he do a man that tel can naugh, "What *sais* thou?"

*Ib.*, p. 131.

And On thy vew the clirest *Sigh* may Set.

*Ib.*, p. 61.

Perchance yet thou *wotz* not what I say.

*Ib.*, p. 40.

Thou happy plast in strength Of *quietz Rampar*.

*Ib.*, p. 30.

The last word *Rampar*, with the other early Modern English forms *ramper*, *rampire*, *rampier*, etc., from Old French *rempar(t)*, may of course be looked upon as an archaism, but in the case of the other words above exemplified, it is merely and exclusively a question of pronunciation that we have to do with.

From all that we have adduced we have therefore a right to conclude that there cannot be the least doubt that Levins admitted *Egipt* among the words in *ip*, because the ordinary pronunciation of his day allowed him to do so. And so, in perfect accordance with this, we find in the *Manipulus* in col. 9 "ye *Draftes* of wine" in the subsection "*In affe*"; in col. 218 "ye *Boult* of a doore, A *coult*, A *Boult* to shoote, [and] An *Hoult* of wood" in the subsection "*In oule*"; and in col. 222 "A *Booste*, *boxe*, *pixis*" in the subsection "*In oose*".

The occurrence of *month* under *ont* ("mouth" and "out" in Wheatley's text are two misprints) is also accounted for by the pronunciation of the time. We may as well say here directly that Levins registers *the Earth* under the ending *earte*, and *y<sup>e</sup> Fifth* under the ending *ift*.

As early as 1861, Richard Grant White in his first edition of Shakespeare's works (vol. XII, pp. 431 ff.) brought forward strong evidence to prove that in Queen Elizabeth's

time *th* was pronounced as *t* more frequently than at present. On this point Grant White is undoubtedly right in the main. But there are weak points in his argument, because the material at his disposal was not extensive enough, and its true significance for the questions he discussed, was not fully realised by him.

In our opinion the question should be put in a somewhat different way. Final *th*, final *t*, and final *d*, and for that matter other consonants too, were often dropped in pronunciation. Henry Sweet, without suspecting that his dictum applies with almost equal directness to English pronunciation about 1600, says on pp. 27 and 28 of *A History of English Sounds* 1888: "Final consonants are very easily dropped, being uttered with less force than initial ones. The audibility of final stops depends mainly on the off-glide, and if this is suppressed, they become almost inaudible, and this was probably the beginning of that wholesale dropping of final consonants which we see in French. French keeps final consonants before another word beginning with a vowel (*liaison*), but Old Bulgarian drops all final consonants without exception, . . . . . Other languages, such as Greek, allow only certain consonants at the end of a word — mostly vowellikes. Final consonant-groups are often very deficient in sonority, . . .". If now we find that this "deficiency in sonority" was carried so far that final *th*, *d*, and *t* were often not heard at all, we may safely take for granted that in certain positions they were heard so indistinctly as to give rise to confusion and interchange between them. The dropping and the confusion in the case of these consonants are strikingly illustrated by the well-known preterite *quoth*, which in Elizabethan books is found under the forms *quo'*, *quad*, *quot(e)* and *quoth*.

So far as we know, Grant White's contention has not found favour in any quarter, most probably because A. J. Ellis has contested it in his *Early English Pronunciation*, and has come to the following conclusion: "There does not appear to be any reason for concluding that the genuine English *th* ever had the sound of (t), although some final *t*'s have fallen into (th)".

We shall not here transcribe the whole of Grant White's argument, but we think it expedient to discuss *all* the objections without exception which Ellis has raised against it.

1<sup>o</sup> Ellis is probably right in his contention that White's example of the use of *t'one* and *t'other* for *the one* and *the other* proves nothing, because *t'one* and *t'other* are thought to have been "that (thet) one", "that (thet) other", passing into *the-tone*, *the-tother* and *tone*, *tother*.

2<sup>o</sup> Ellis rightly observes that *fifth*, *sixth* and *eighth* are quite modern spellings and sounds. But this observation of Ellis's is scarcely relevant, because it leaves the argument intact. The spellings *fift* and *fifth*, etc., which are both of very frequent occurrence, prove the confusion then prevailing in pronunciation; and the confusion arose from the indistinct sound of the final consonant, *if* it was pronounced at all. Evidence that this final consonant was either altogether dropped or only optionally pronounced, we find as late as 1704 on p. 105 of Dr. Jones's book, where he says that the words *clift*, *drift*, *lift*, *shift*, *fift*, etc. are pronounced with or without *t*.

3<sup>o</sup> Grant White says that *Whats tys* (= this) occurs twice in *Wyt and Science*, Shak. Soc. Ed., p. 21. Ellis observes: "*tys* may be simply a misprint". Of course, it may be a misprint. But, and we would lay some stress on this as a general rule, it will hardly do always to speak of mis-

prints, if in these misprints there is found a very definite method, and if the same sort of misprints consistently reappears in all kinds of printed books, without its being possible to assign a technical or typographical reason for it. Nor does Ellis take upon him to characterise as misprints all the spellings cited by Grant White; to many of them he does not even allude. We cannot forbear from observing here that one of the great defects of Ellis's method is, that in making general inferences as regards pronunciation he has disregarded, or at all events taken far too little notice of the spelling of the words as found in the first editions of sixteenth and seventeenth century writers.

4° White cites *cautherising* from Timon of Athens V 1, 136. Ellis justly observes that the first Folio reads *Cantherizing*, but we do not follow him in calling this a misprint. Not improbably, Shakespeare has here used the word *cantere*, a variant form of *cauter* (see Cambridge Shak. Vol. VII, p. 137). *Cantherizing* does not fit in with the metre, and in our opinion is a printer's quasi-elucidation.

5° White says that *gamut* occurs four times in the Shakespeare Folio of 1623, and always with final *th*. Ellis observes that "the derivation is obscure"<sup>1)</sup>. As in the case of *fift*, Ellis's observation does not affect the argument, and the consistent divergent spelling furnishes evidence of the confusion.

6° White cites several spellings from Sir Balthazar Gerbier's Interpreter of the Academie for Forrain Languages and all Noble Sciences and Exercises, 1648; "which is printed with remarkable accuracy", as he is careful to add. Ellis answers: "The usages of the Fleming Gerbier are not

---

<sup>1)</sup> See now the H. E. D. i. v. *gamut*.

Van Dam & Stoffel, Chapters.

entitled to much weight. He probably could not pronounce (th), . . .” We fear that an objection of this kind carries far less weight. Logic would at the very least have demanded the specification of other slips or blunders on Gerbier’s part, before Ellis could expect continental scholars to side with him on this special point. But Ellis has done no such thing.

7<sup>o</sup> White adduces the following puns from Shakespeare’s works:

*goats* — *Goths* in *As you like it* III 3, 7 & 9.

[We may add *feutures* for *feathers*, just before.]

*nothing* (*noting*) in *Much Ado* II 3, 59.

„ „ in *Winter’s Tale* IV 4, 625.

a green *vit* (*with*) in *Love’s Labour’s Lost* I 2, 94.

Ellis admits the optional pronunciation of *Goths* with *t*, and in concluding his remarks on Grant White’s observations says: “The upshot of Mr. White’s researches seems, therefore, to be that writers of the XVIth and XVIIth centuries were very loose in using *t*, *th*, in non-Saxon words. That this looseness of writing sometimes affected pronunciation, we know by the familiar example *author* and its derivatives”. But Ellis thinks it quite out of the question that the same “looseness of writing” and pronunciation could occur in the case of genuine Saxon words. With respect to the two “nothing” puns he says: “It seems more reasonable to conclude that *nothing* [in both passages!] was originally a misprint for *noting*, which was followed by subsequent editors. It is the only word which makes sense . . . The joke on *noting*, and *nothing*, supposing the jingle to answer, is inappreciable in both cases. But dismissing all reference to *nothing* and *noting* as perfectly untenable, there is no doubt that Mr. White has proved *Moth* in LL to mean *Mote* . . .”

It is plain from this that the "misprint" hypothesis is becoming more and more untenable, and the rest of what Ellis adduces here to combat White hardly deserves notice.

As regards *wit* Ellis admits that it "alludes to Dalilah's green withe". And he goes on to demolish the evidence furnished by the pun, in a fashion that will amply repay attentive study: "But how should *wit* and *withe* be confused? Have we not the key in that false pronunciation of the Latin final *-t* and *-d* as *-th*, that is, either (th) or (dh), which we find reprobated by both Palsgrave and Salesbury? There is no reason to suppose that *wit* was even occasionally called (with); we have only to suppose that *Mote* — who is a boy that probably knew Latin, at least in school jokes, witness . . . [L. L. L. V 1, 72] . . . — would not scruple, if it suited his purpose, to alter the termination of a word in the Latin school fashion, and make (wit) into (with) or (widh) or to merely add on the sound of (th), thus (witth), as we now do in the word *eighth* = (*eeth*). We find him doing the very same thing, when, for the sake of a pun, he alters *wittoll*, as the word is spelled in the fo. MW 2, 2, 83 (51', 313), into *wit-old*, LL 5, 1, 26 (150', 66)". *Se non è vero, è ben trovato!*

But it is far from being true. As regards *wittol(d)*, what we have to deal with is not an illegitimate alteration and arbitrary ill-treatment of a word, but a phenomenon of everyday occurrence in the pronunciation of XVI and XVII century English. We have satisfactorily proved in *Prosody and Text* that final *-d* was often dropped in pronunciation, and that as a necessary consequence *d* was appended to various words where it had no business whatever. We think it quite superfluous to restate the arguments there given; *d* and *t* are completely on a par in this respect.

A highly interesting point on the other hand is "that false pronounciation of the Latin final *-t* and *-d*". In *Lesclarcissement de la Langue Francoyse* (1530). Maistre Jehan Palsgraue thus delivers himself: "D in all maner thynges confermeth hym to the general rules aboue rehersed, so that I se no particular thyng wherof to warne the lernar, save that they sounde nat *d* of *ad* in these words, *adultire*, *adoptiön*, *adoulcér*, like *th*, as we of our tonge do in these wordes of latine *ath athjuuandum* for *ad adjuuandum* corruptly". Ellis observes on this: "I have assumed this *th* to mean (dh) as being derived from *d*. But Salesbury writes (*kicith*) for *quid*".

We also know that in the English pronounciation of Latin then prevailing, final *-t* was pronounced as *th*. For this we have the direct testimony of Salesbury as regards the words *amat*, *dederit*, and *legit*. Besides, Palsgrave says with regard to the French word *est*: "if the next worde folowyng begyn with a vowell, it shall be sounded *et*: but neuer *est* sounding *s*, nor *eth*, soundynge *t* like *th*, for *t* hath neuer no suche sounde in the frenche tonge."

Are we to infer from this that in Palsgrave's time *t* had this sound in English? As we have seen, it certainly was thus sounded in a commonly used pronounciation of Latin, which, however, Palsgrave expressly condemned.

And if we now put the question, how this preposterous pronounciation of Latin *t* and *d* as *th* could become usual, while it has never been heard of in any other country, we venture to think that the only possible answer must be that the confusion in the pronounciation of Latin must be accounted for by a similar confusion which at some time prevailed in the pronounciation of English. Ellis's argument

against the confusion in Saxon words turns out to be a wrong argument *in favour of* this confusion.

8° Ellis attacks White's contention that in *Much ado about nothing*, "nothing" might stand for "noting", by pointing to the necessary antithesis of *much* and *nothing*. We shall not here go into the question whether Grant White is right or wrong, but Ellis's argument is of the weakest, since the antithesis which of course every one admits, need really not prevent *nothing* from giving occasion to a word-play. We should hardly have referred to this point, if we had not thought it useful to point out that Ellis seems to have had no ear for puns—a defect of audition which the attentive reader may indeed have discovered for himself from some of his utterances cited higher up.

9° Ellis observes: "Mr. White . . . quotes the *assonance*, which he regards as a rhyme: doting nothing", Shakespeare's sonnets, XX 10 & 12.

We have here an instance of one of the most serious mistakes in the method which Ellis has followed in investigating the pronunciation of "Early English". Ellis takes for granted that after Chaucer not one English poet has invariably employed reliable perfect rhymes, so that according to him rhymes are useless as material to make inferences from, regarding pronunciation. But the simple truth is, that there is not a single reason for assuming that English poets anterior to Chaucer did not use rhymes as pure as those employed by him. Ellis has evidently overlooked the circumstance that rhymes, not of English poets only, often represent and require an obsolete or obsolescent pronunciation of the words in question. One poet imitates another, and in this way a sort of poetical dialect springs up, of which conventionalism is one of the most strongly marked characteristics.

This conservatism acts in various directions, in the retention of words and constructions that have altogether disappeared from the spoken language, as well as in pronunciation, for instance. To give one well-known instance, we would just observe here that Webster notes concerning the substantive *wind*, "in poetry and among singers this word is often pronounced *wīnd*".

When Ellis scrutinises the rhymes made use of by Moore and Tennyson, he comes upon a great many that are "as bad rhymes as can be"; as "mere assonances", he brands. for instance, "breathe wreath, breathes sheaths, bliss his, else tells, house s. boughs, &c., ice flies &c."

It is no doubt true that these rhymes are antiquated according to the pronunciation of our day. How they should be looked upon, may be partially gathered from p. 192 of Sweet's History of English Sounds:

"Hence every unstress weak monosyllable with (ð, z, v) must originally have had a corresponding stress or strong form with (þ, s, f). We still preserve this distinction in our *of* and *off*, and the older pronunciation (wip) for (wið) is no doubt the remains of a similar distinction, which was not kept up, because no divergence of meaning or grammatical function had developed itself, as in the case of *of* and *off*. Such rhymes as *blis : is* in Chaucer, *wace (= was) : face* in Morris's Alliterative Poems seem to point to a similar distinction between strong (is, his) and weak (iz, hiz)".

Now it is exceedingly difficult to determine the terminus ad quem the two pronunciations are kept alive side by side by the spoken language. While Sweet, as we see, no longer recognises the older pronunciation of *with* for contemporary English, Ellis still admits it, for he says: "*with* seems however

to have been always (with) [in the XVI, XVII, and XVIII centuries], though (widh) is now more common".

Prof. Jespersen (Studier over Engelske Kasus, § 179), however, states that "already Hart (1569) has both forms indiscriminately . . . the other older phoneticians as a rule have *wip*: Smith 1568, Bullokar 1580 . . . , Gil 1619, Butler 1633, Cooper 1658; and this pronunciation is still far from rare, especially with Irishmen, Scotsmen, and Americans".

Gil, as we also learn from a note on p. 191 of Jespersen's book, says expressly, that in the words *with* and *of* the voiced sound (ð, v) is the more usual one, and the voiceless sound (p, f) more solemn and pedantic: "proinde licet frequentius dicamus . . . *wid* . . . *ov* . . . tamen . . . sequamur scribendi consuetudinem tantum: idque quod docti aliqui viri sic legunt (!) et aliquando (!) loquuntur".

The two pronunciations of final *-th* and *-s*, i. e. the indistinct utterance of these final consonants may have been especially noticeable in unstress weak monosyllables, but there is no doubt that stress words often showed the same tendency.

Ellis's objection to Moore's rhyme *breathe wreath* has not a leg to stand on. Knowles, Moore's countryman and contemporary, gives *dh* as the only pronunciation of the final consonant of *wreath*. In 1806 Walker admitted both *th* and *dh* in the pronunciation of this word.

Let us now listen to the other strictures which Ellis makes upon the rhymes of Moore and Tennyson: "The rhymes of an unaccented and accented syllable are all bad<sup>1)</sup>),

---

<sup>1)</sup> Rhymes of unaccented and accented syllables are non-existent. They seemingly occur about 1600, but all the lines cited to exemplify them are corrupt. Here, however, Ellis is referring to rhymes of stress syllables with syllables bearing the secondary stress. Such rhymes

but the double use of unaccented final *-y*, *-ies*, to rhyme either with *(-ii, -iiz)* or *(-ei, -eiz)* at the convenience of the poet is really distressing; compare: agony I, agonies sees;" etc.

It is difficult to understand how a man like Ellis could take up such a position. Why, we ask, may not a poet avail himself of two different pronunciations both of them allowable? What other principle, after all, is here involved than in the question whether a poet should be free to use *thou hast* instead of *you have*, if it suits his purpose?

All the other strictures made by Ellis refer exclusively to vowel-sounds, but they need no longer occupy us, since we are at present only interested in the question whether English poets after Chaucer made use of assonances instead of rhymes. We have seen that Ellis has furnished evidence of their occurrence in Moore and Tennyson in his own imagination only. If such assonances existed, they would be found to occur in connection with all sorts of different consonants, as they are well-known to do in Spanish poetry. The fact that no evidence of this is forthcoming, and that we only meet with a number of cases that are satisfactorily accounted for by the still surviving double pronunciation of *th* and *s*, is sufficient to show that the theory of assonances is baseless, and that we shall have to cast about for another explanation.

In the thousands of rhymes in Spenser's *Faery Queen* Ellis has found no more than *thirteen* so-called assonances. One of them, *near:few*, is a corruption introduced by the

cannot be found fault with. They occur in all Teutonic languages, in all poets, in all periods. There is no reasonable ground for Ellis's objection to them. Besides, the laws of rhyme must needs be deduced from the practice of the poets, who would hardly recognise Ellis for their law-giver.

printer, and has by us been disposed of elsewhere (Prosody and Text, p. 306). Half of the remaining cases concern *n* and *m* rhymes, *alone: home*, etc. These *n* and *m* rhymes are found in all Spenser's contemporaries, and are perfect hymes.

Dr. Jones, writing in the opening years of the eighteenth century, says on p. 75 of the book from which we have repeatedly quoted:

"Note that the sound [of N] is like that of *m*, but more like that of *ng*; and both easier than *n*. Therefore *n* doth often take the sound of *m* and *ng*".

From which we may infer that in his time *n* was, or might be, pronounced as *m*.

The other six cases must undoubtedly also be accounted for by the pronunciation of the time. It would, however, carry us too far, if we were here to take upon us to prove the certainty or the very great probability of our view in each of these cases, the more so as every one will allow. That, looking at the tremendous number of rhymes in the 'Aery Queen, in a text that has been tampered with in the printing-office, these six remaining cases can have no demonstrative force to speak of, as regards the optional use of assonances instead of rhymes.

The few cases of assonance which Ellis pretends to have discovered in Shakespeare, must be disposed of in exactly the same way.

We have no wish to belittle the great services rendered by Ellis; we respect him as an indefatigable worker, as an energetic pioneer, as a high-minded scholar, who generously sacrificed his means and his working powers in the cause of science; but this must by no means blind us to the fact that Ellis often went astray, so that also in his case implicit

dependence on the results obtained by him, which seems to be the all but general rule in England. will prove an impediment, instead of a help towards attaining to the truth in the field which he so assiduously cultivated.

The upshot of the lengthy considerations we have submitted to the reader is, that Ellis has not shaken the main thesis set up by Grant White, and that Levins's placing *month* under the ending *out* can be accounted for by the pronunciation of his time.

As regards cases of interchange of *d*, *t*, and *th*, we had at first neglected to collect the examples that we came across in the course of our reading. The batch of instances which we subjoin, is somewhat scanty therefore:

. . . the whyche y haue done feytfully to the . . .

The Revelation to the Monk of Evesham. 1482 (Repr. Arber, p. 44).

Neuertelese yn alle suche peynys and tormentys . . .

Id. p. 61.

. . . that no tokyn of hyt. ne signe of rednes or of whythnes remaynyd aboute the meruelus curacion of god.

Id. p. 112.

. . . wherevpon I attempted with the consent of 5 hundreth<sup>1)</sup> Christians, fellow slaues with my selfe, . . .

E. Webbe, His Trauailles 1590 (Repr. Arber, p. 28).

. . . within a few hundreth yeeres after Christ.

Bible Transl. Pref. 1611, p. 5. (Murray).

We add an instance of the Scottish form *eard* for *earth*, from King James I:

Or throwing Phaeton downe from heauen to eard

With threatning thunders, making monstrous reard.<sup>2)</sup>

The Essayes of a Prentise (Repr. Arber, p. 13).

This last quotation enables us to illustrate the three divergent forms of the word *earth*, viz. *eard* in King James,

<sup>1)</sup> The form *hundreth* is from Old Norse, and is found as late as the 18th century, according to the New English Dictionary(?).

<sup>2)</sup> The usual Scottish spelling is *reird* = noise, from O. E. *reord* = voice.

*eart* in Levins, and *er* in Queen Elizabeth, which form an interesting analogue with the forms *quod*, *quot*, and *quo'* for *quoth*, which we have adduced on p. 31.

The occurrence of the word *world* under the ending *orle* is in the same way accounted for by the then common dropping of final *d* in such cases (see p. 35).

Nor does the word *leashe* under *east* constitute an error of arrangement; the fact of its occurrence there only proves that Levins spelt or pronounced this word without *h* and with an excrescent *t*. On the same principle we find him citing the word *tabor* (*tympanum*) in the spelling *tabarte* among the words with the ending *arte*. Forms analogous with *tabarte* (= *tabor*) are continually met with in Elizabethan literature, e. g. *margent*, *orphant*, etc.. etc.

We have now arrived at the "very unsystematic manner" in which Wheatley finds the words in *ed* and *er* arranged. It is no doubt true that this arrangement leaves a great deal to be wished for. Most probably it is equally true that some of the irregularities must be laid at the printer's door, and can be accounted for with comparative facility. And presumably it is true also that Wheatley has not fully realised to himself Levins's practice of placing rhyming words under each other, so that the alphabetical order, which plays an important part in the subsections, to the superficial observer seems to be broken into in the most arbitrary way. But all these considerations do not in the least affect our argument, *because after all the words are placed under their proper headings*.

Neither this last stricture on Wheatley's part nor his other objections, can make us admit the possibility that Levins could have deliberately placed *pin* under the ending *il*, or *to morow* under *ay*. The occurrence of these words in

the places where we find them in Levins's book, originates in a quasi-correction made by the printer.

The second point which we wish to illustrate by fresh evidence, is concerned with the mutual relations of authors and printers with respect to the printed texts, so far as light is thrown on these relations by the testimony of the authors and printers themselves.

The grievances of an author, and the unmannerly independence of a printer are strikingly illustrated by the following letter:

To my approued good Friend, Mr. Nicholas Okes.

The infinite faults escaped in my booke of *Britaines Troy*, by thenegligence of the Printer, as the misquotations, mistaking of sillables, misplacing halfe lines, coining of strange and neuer heard of words. These being without number, when I would haue taken a particular account of the *Errata*, the Printer answered me. hee would not publish his owne disworkemanship, but rather let his owne fault lye upon the necke of the Author: and being fearefull that others of his quality, had beene of the same nature, and condition. and finding you on the contrary, so carefull, and industrious, so serious and laborious to doe the Author all the rights of the presse, I could not choose but gratulate your honest indeauours with this short remembrance. Here likewise. I must necessarily insert a manifest iniury done me in that worke, by taking the two Epistles of *Paris* to *Helen*, and *Helen* to *Paris*, and printing them in a lesse volume <sup>1)</sup>, vnder the name of another, which may put the world in opinion I might steale them from him; and hee to doe himselfe right, hath since published them in his owne name: but as I must acknowledge my lines not worthy his patronage, vnder whom he hath publist them, so the Author I know much offended with M. *Iaggard* (that altogether vnknowne to him) presumed to make so bold with his name. These, and the like dishonesties I know you to bee cleere of; and I could wish but to bee the happy Author of so worthy a worke as I could willingly commit to your care and workmanship.

Yours euer

Thomas Heywood.

---

<sup>1)</sup> Viz. in the 1612 reprint of *The Passionate Pilgrime*.

The above letter is printed at the end of *An Apology For Actors. Containing, etc. Written by Thomas Heywood. London, Printed by Nicholas Okes 1612.*

Let the reader remember the name of the printer incriminated in it, W. Jaggard.

From the printer's preface to the first edition (1590) of Marlowe's *Tamburlaine* it becomes evident that the printer, on his own authority, on critical grounds cancelled certain passages of this drama, in the face of the fact that these very passages had been applauded at its performance; the printer thus delivers himself:

To the gentlemen readers: and others that . . .  
 . . . I haue (purposely) omitted and left out some fond and friuolous Iestures, digressing (and in my poore opinion) far vnmeet for the matter, which I thought might seeme more tedious vnto the wise than any way els to be regarded, though (happly) they haue bene of some vaine conceited fondlings greatly gaped at, what times they were shewed vpon the stage in their graced deformities: neuertheles now, to be mixtured in print with such matter of worth, it wuld prooue a great disgrace to so honorable and stately a historie . . .

Yours, most humble at commaundement,  
 R[ichard] J[hones] Printer.

The first edition of *Tamburlaine* appeared in Marlowe's lifetime; before his death it was reprinted with the same preface in 1592.

From the hand of Gabriell Harvey, *Imprinted by Iohn Wolfe, London, 1593*, there appeared *Pierces Supererogation or a new prayse of the Old Asse. A Preparative to certaine larger Discourses, intituled Nashes S. Fame.*

At the end of this little book (p. Ff1) the printer addresses the reader in this wise:

Errours escaped in the Printing.  
 With certaine Additions to be inserted.

.....  
 Know also, Gentle Reader, that it was the Writers meaning to deuide this Treatise into three bookes: the Second beginning at the *Aduertisement to Pap-hatchet, and Martin Mar-prelate*: the Third at, *So then of Pappadocio*: but in the Originall, or vncorrected Coppy there was not any such diuision expressly sett-downe: neyther were the Additions following, inserted in their proper places. but annexed to the end of the Third booke, & noted thus.

In the First Booke, page 46. after *Cloude*, insert. What speake I of one. *etc.*

From this we find that Harvey has not himself corrected the proofs. The printer lays the blame for the mistakes committed on the insufficient directions given by the author at the end of the book. But to us the most interesting circumstance is, that the printer calls the original manuscript of the author the uncorrected Coppy, thereby leading us to infer that as a rule an author's work was revised and corrected at the printing-office. And now also becomes perfectly clear to us the possibility of the existence of reprints bearing the notice *Newly corrected*, or words to the same effect, in the title-page, while at the same time the text of such reprints bears evidence that the whole of the proof-correcting was done without a look into the author's manuscript.

A strange case, which sheds a highly remarkable side-light on the ways of Jacobean printers, occurred under the following circumstances.

Ralphe Brooke, Yorke Herald, had brought out a *Catalogue of Nobility* in 1619. When this book was somewhat severely handled by competent judges, the compiler excused himself by stating that "many faults and mistakings" must be laid at the printer's door, because "sicknesse absented him from the Presse". The publisher replied with no half

measure. He had the whole book reprinted, and furnished with a running critical commentary. The title of this new book was: *A Discoverie of errors In the first Edition of the Catalogue of Nobility, Published By Ralphe Brooke, Yorke Herald, 1619. And Printed heerewith word for word, etc. By Augustine Vincent, etc. London, Printed by William Iaggard, etc. 1622.*

In one of the somewhat truculent prefatory notes to this publication, the printer, W. Jaggard, thus defends himself:

. . . that in the time of this his vnhappy sicknesse, though hee came not in person to ouer-looke the Presse, yet the *Proofe*, and *Reuiewes* duly attended him, and he perused them (as is well to be iustified) in the maner he did before . . .

A little further on Jaggard thus attempts to account for the blunders committed by the author:

. . . that Master *Yorke* borrowed most of his materialles out of other mens Copies, and copied them commonly by his owne hand, it is probable his Clerkship might faile him, either in reading the text, as *Scogans* scholer, who read Butyrum et Caseum for Brutum et Cassium, or in transcribing, as in a place of his, *Teste Rex apud Northampton*, or when in steed of Nunnes *Cistercians* he writ them *Sister-sences* (as if there had bene but five sisters of the Order) and a number of the like, yet extant in his Copie: which if the Worke-men had bene so madly disposed to tye themselues too, and haue giuen him leaue to print his owne English (which they now repent they did not) hee would (they say) haue made his Reader, as good sport in his Catalogue, as euer *Tarleton* did his Audieuce, in a Clownes part . . . . .

The most characteristic part of this utterance by the master-printer William Jaggard is, that his "worke-men" were not such fools as to consider themselves tied down to what an irresponsible author might think fit to set down in his manuscript. So we see that even the "worke-men" played the critics, and corrected the text according to their

Of course such a system of printing has its advantages as well as its drawbacks; the pity of it is only that the critical typographers also extended it to the manuscripts of Shakespeare's works.

The title-page of the First Folio of Shakespeare's works says: *London Printed by Isaac Iaggard, and Ed. Blount, 1623.* And on the last page of it we read: *Printed at the Charges of W. Jaggard, Ed. Blount, I. Smithcecke, and W. Aspley, 1623.*

According to Sidney Lee<sup>1</sup>), whose authority in these matters stands unchallenged, Blount, Smethwick, and Aspley were publishers or booksellers, not printers; William Jaggard and his son Isaac were printers, and the Folio of 1623 was no doubt set up in type, and struck off at the printing-shop of Jaggard Senior near St. Dunstan's Church.

With Jaggard Senior we have become sufficiently acquainted by this time; we would in conclusion only point to the great probability that the "worke-men" who in 1623 printed the Folio of Shakespeare's works, were the same persons who in 1622 were by their employer said to "repent" that in 1619 they had not allowed Ralphe Brooke to come out in print in "his owne English".

Need we wonder that Thomas Middleton in *Father Hubbard's Tale* wistfully said: "I never wisht myself a better fortune than to fall into the hands of a truespelling printer"?

---

<sup>1</sup>) *A Life of William Shakespeare by Sidney Lee. London. Smith, Elder, & Co. 1898. See p. 304.*

II.

THE DOGMA

OF THE

"EXTRA SYLLABLES"

IN THE HEROIC AND THE BLANK-VERSE LINE.

(XVI. AND XVII. CENTURY.)

---

To ignorants obdurde, quhair wilful errorr lyis,  
Nor zit to curious folks, quhilks carping dois deiect thee,  
Nor zit to learned men, quha thinks thame onelie wyis,  
Bot to the docile bairns of knowledge I direct thee.

King James I.

The great majority of Heroic and Blank-verse lines in English poetry consist of ten syllables, or of ten syllables *plus* an unaccented eleventh one. This unstressed eleventh syllable is immaterial to the purposes of the present chapter, and will therefore remain undiscussed in the sequel.

*Extra Syllables* in the Heroic or Blank-verse line come into question when the number of syllables in such lines is greater than usual. Thus, to take the first example that occurs to us, there are two extra syllables in line 270 of Tennyson's *Geraint and Enid*:

On a sudden, many a voice along the street,

The exceptional character of a line like the one just cited, is also sometimes marked by stating that it contains

two *Trisyllabic Measures*, the trisyllabic measures in this case being *On a sud-* and *-ny a voice*.

Again, a favourite mode of representing the matter consists in saying that in the line cited the first and the third iambic foot have been replaced by anapæsts, though it cannot but be regretted that these technical terms of classic metric art, which are apt to breed interminable confusion, should continue to be applied to modern verse, which has absolutely nothing in common with Latin and Greek versification.

Extra Syllables are of somewhat frequent occurrence in the Heroic and Blank-verse line of our day. They are there generally looked upon as things of beauty, which pleasantly and ingeniously diversify the monotony of a too strictly regular incidence of stressed syllables.

All nineteenth century authorities on English prosody — we only mention Guest <sup>1)</sup>, Abbott <sup>2)</sup>, Ellis <sup>3)</sup>, and Mayor <sup>4)</sup> among Englishmen, and of Germans, Schipper <sup>5)</sup> and König <sup>6)</sup>

<sup>1)</sup> *A History of English Rhythms*. By Edwin Guest Esq. M. A. Fellow of Caius College, Cambridge. Two Volumes. London, W. Pickering, 1838.

<sup>2)</sup> *A Shakespearian Grammar*. By E. A. Abbott, D. D., Head Master of the City of London School. London. MacMillan and Co. 1894 (First Edition 1869).

<sup>3)</sup> *On Early English Pronunciation, with especial reference to Shakspeare and Chaucer*, . . . By Alexander J. Ellis, F. R. S., F. S. A., Fellow of the Cambridge Philosophical Society, etc. Part. III. London: Published for the Philological Society by Asher & Co., etc. 1871.

<sup>4)</sup> *Chapters on English Metre* By Joseph B. Mayor, M. A. London: C. J. Clay and Sons, 1886.

<sup>5)</sup> *Englische Metrik in historischer und systematischer Entwicklung dargestellt* von Dr. J. Schipper, ordentl. Professor der englischen Philologie an der K. K. Universität in Wien. Bonn, Verlag von Emil Strauss, 1882—1889. Two Volumes.

<sup>6)</sup> *Der Vers in Shakesperes Dramen* von Goswin König. Strassburg. Karl J. Trübner, 1888.

— though differing with each other on all sorts of points, are perfectly agreed that also in the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries the extra syllables occur in English metre in the same way as they do now.

This in our opinion is a decided error, and it is the purpose of the present chapter to lay before the reader certain arguments which have led us to the conviction that poets of the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries do not make use of extra syllables in the Heroic and the Blank-verse line.

We also think that "extra syllables" do not occur in Chaucer's verse, but considerations of space, and the desire to avoid the treatment of too many details, have decided us to confine our argument to the poetry of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

In entering upon our task, our very first duty is to take careful cognizance of what the old poets themselves, or those who have written about the art of poetry, tell us about the technical principles of their own versification or that of their contemporaries.

Our first authority is George Gascoigne<sup>1)</sup>, a poet of great note in his day, and a man who could speak with authority. On pp. 33 and 34 of his "Notes" he says: "note you that commonly now a dayes in english rimes (for I dare not call them English verses) we vse none other order but foote of two sillables, wherof the first is depressed or made short, and the second is eleuate or made long: and that sound or scanning continueth throughout the verse.

---

<sup>1)</sup> G. Gascoigne, *Certaine notes of Instruction concerning the making of verse or ryme in English*, written at the request of Master Edouardo Donati. — First published in 1575. Our quotations are made from Arber's Reprint of 1869.

We have vsed in times past other kinde of Meeters: as for example this following:

No wight in this wórlde, that weálth can attáyne,  
Unlêsse he belêue, that ál is but ráyne”.

According to this utterance of Gascoigne's, therefore, the Trisyllabic Measure was inadmissible in the English metre of his time.

But this inadmissibility is proved by something else still. Gascoigne bases his classification of various kinds of poetry: 1<sup>o</sup> on the number of syllables in a line of verse; 2<sup>o</sup> on the number of lines that constitutes a stanza, and 3<sup>o</sup> on the distribution and disposition of the rhymes. Now it goes without saying that if extra syllables are admissible in a line, it becomes utterly impossible to take the number of syllables as a basis of classification. But it is precisely this classification according to the number of syllables that Gascoigne invariably insists on, as will be seen from the following table, in which we give a survey of *all* the sorts of verse referred to by Gascoigne, arranged according to the characteristics mentioned by him:

| Name                 | Number of syllables in line | Number of lines of stanza | Rhyme-scheme   | Other characteristics                               |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|----------------|-----------------------------------------------------|
| Rithme royall        | 10                          | 7                         | ababbcc        | { “doth end w<br>oneself same fo<br>or repeticion”. |
| Ballade              | 6, or 8, or 10              | 6                         | ababcc         |                                                     |
| rondlette            | ad libitum,<br>but even (?) | ad libitum                | ad libitum     |                                                     |
| Sonnets              | 10                          | 14                        | ababedcdefefgg |                                                     |
| Dyzaynes             | 10 (?)                      | 10                        | ababedcdee (?) |                                                     |
| Syxaines             | 10 (?)                      | 6                         | ababcc (?)     | { “as Father<br>Chaucer use                         |
| Vishlayes (Verlayes) | 10                          | 5                         | ababa          |                                                     |
| ?                    | 10                          | 4                         | abba           |                                                     |
| Poulters measure     | 12 & 14 by turns            | no stanza                 | aabbcc, etc.   |                                                     |
| ryding rime          | ?                           | ?                         | ?              |                                                     |

Gascoigne says expressly that he does not pretend to give an exhaustive enumeration, so we need not wonder at his leaving blank verse unnoticed. The structure of the lines of his blank-verse poem, *The Steele Glas*, however, is absolutely identical with that of his rhyming lines of ten syllables, and on p. 38 he observes: "Rythme royall is a verse of tenne syllables, and seuen such verses make a staffe, wherof, etc."

We see that Gascoigne's definitions leave nothing to be wished for on the score of clearness, so that it is quite impossible to misunderstand his drift as regards the non-occurrence of extra syllables in his system of versification.

Our second authority is King James I. (VI. of Scotland)<sup>1)</sup>, who, like Gascoigne, not only wrote about poetry, but practised it too.

With the same unmistakable clearness as Gascoigne he says on p. 58 of his *Revlis*:

"The forme of placeing syllables in verse, is this. That zour first syllabe in the lyne be short, the second lang, the thrid short; the fourt lang, the fyft short, the sixt lang, and sa furth to the end of the lyne".

Here, too, absolute ignoring of the extra syllables. If such extra syllables had occurred in the lines, King James would have classed such lines under "tumbling verse", as appears from his words on pp. 63 and 64:

"Ze man obserue that thir *Tumbling* verse flowis not on that fassoun, as vtheris dois. For all vtheris keipis the reule quhilk I gaue before, To wit, the first fute<sup>2)</sup> short the second lang, and sa furth. Quhair as thir hes twa

---

<sup>1)</sup> *The Revlis and Cavtelis to be observit and eschewit in Scottis Poesie*. — First published in 1585. Our quotations are from Arber's Reprint of 1869.

<sup>2)</sup> The word *fute* often denotes what we should call a syllable.

short, and ane lang through all the lyne, quhen they keip ordour: albeit the maist pairt of thame be out of ordour. and keipis na kynde nor reule of *Flouring*, and for that cause are callit *Tumbling verse*:"

We see that King James here distinguishes between two kinds of "tumbling verse", of which the first has a regular. the second an irregular incidence of stressed syllables.

For purposes of comparison, and because the point is not without interest, we also subjoin a table of the various kinds of verse mentioned by King James. It will be seen that his descriptions do not on all points tally with those given by Gascoigne. We must at the same time observe that the table about to be given, unlike the one drawn from Gascoigne's *Notes of Instruction*, has no force as evidence, because King James gives his own definitions of the kinds of verse only in a few cases: as a rule he names the kind of verse, and appends an example of it. Our figures, etc., except those in italics, have therefore been inferred from the examples.

| Name                     | Number of syllables in line | Number of lines of stanza | Rhyme-scheme   | Other characteristics              |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|----------------|------------------------------------|
| ryme                     | 10                          | no stanza                 | aabb, etc.     | "zit are nocht vers                |
| Heroicall                | 10                          | 9                         | aabaabeac      |                                    |
| Ballat Royal             | 10                          | 8                         | ababbebe       |                                    |
| Troilus verse            | 10                          | 7                         | ababbaa        |                                    |
| Bouncefallis or Tumbling | varying                     | 13                        | ababababedddie | not short, long, short, long, etc. |
| Sonet verse              | 10                          | 14                        | ababbeccededee |                                    |
| common verse             | 8                           | 6                         | ababce         |                                    |
| ?                        | 10                          | 6                         | ababce         |                                    |
| broken verse             | varying                     | ad libitum                | ad libitum     | short, long, short, long, etc.     |

Our third authority is William Webbe<sup>1)</sup>. Graduate. He writes on p. 56 of his *Discourse*:

<sup>1)</sup> A Discourse of English Poetrie. -- First published in 1586. Our quotations are from Arber's Reprint of 1870.

"The most vsuall and frequented kind of our English Poetry hath alwayes runne vpon, and to this day is obserued in such equall number of syllables, and likenes of wordes, that in all places one verse either immediatly, or by mutuall interposition, may be aunswerable to an other both in proportion of length, and ending of lynes in the same Letters".

Once more we have here direct testimony as to the non-existence of extra syllables, and the testimony is of the greater value in the present case as the avowed drift of Webbe's booklet is a continuous protest against rhyme and against the monotonous regularity of English verse, which he considers barbarous, and wishes to reform on the model of classic metre, to which rhyme was unknown, and which frequently varied the number of syllables in a line according to an ingeniously constructed system of rules, in Webbe's opinion far preferable to the "equall number of syllables" that forms the basis of English metre.

Webbe, like the others, classifies the various kinds of English verse in the first place according to the number of syllables that make up a line. His mode of classification furnishes as strong proof as Gascoigne's for the non-existence of extra syllables. We shall not cite all his utterances referring to this point, but restrict ourselves to one interesting passage, in which Webbe discusses the various kinds of verse exemplified in Spenser's *Shepheardes Calender* (p. 59):

"The first of them is of tenne sillables, or rather fieve feete in one verse, thus,

A Shepheardes boy no better doo him call,  
When Winters wastfull spight was almost spent.

This verse he vseth commonly in hys sweete complayntes. and mornefull ditties, as very agreeable to such affections.

The second sort hath naturally but nyne syllables, and is a more rough or clownish manner of verse, vsed most commonly of him if you mark him in hys satyricall reprehensions, and his Sheepeheardes homelyest talke, such as the second Æglogue is.

Ah for pittie wyll rancke Winters rage,  
These bytter blasts neuer gynne to asswage.

The number of nine sillables in thys verse is very often altered, and so it may without any disgrace to the same, especially where the specche should be most clownish and simple, which is much obserued of hym.

The third kynd is a pretty rounde verse, running currantly together, commonly seauen sillables or sometime eyght in one verse, *etc.*"

Since Webbe's account of the second and the third kind of verse clearly shows that he lays especial stress on the number of syllables in each line, we may readily take for granted that, if in the first kind, the Heroic Line, extra syllables had been admissible, he would certainly have said that this kind of verse had "naturally" ten syllables, but might also have eleven, twelve and even more. But he says no such thing.

Our fourth authority is George Puttenham<sup>1</sup>). The technical aspects of English versification, the subject that exclusively interests us in this connection, are, however, by no means Puttenham's strong point. And where our three first authorities always express themselves clearly and logically, so as to exclude misunderstanding, and are never found to be at variance with themselves, Puttenham on the

---

<sup>1</sup>) The Arte of English Poesie. — First published in 1589. Our quotations are from Arber's Reprint of 1869.

contrary repeatedly contradicts himself, and often mixes up things that should be carefully kept asunder.

Puttenham's book contains one passage that may impress superficial readers as a positive statement as to the existence of extra syllables in ordinary English verse. We cite the whole of Chapter XVI. on pp. 142 & 143:

*"Of your verses perfect and defectiue, and that which the  
Gracians called the halfe foote.*

The Greekes and Latines vsed verses in the odde sillable of two sortes, which they called *Catalecticke* and *Acatalecticke*, that is odde vnder and odde ouer the iust measure of their verse, and we in our vulgar finde many of the like, and specially in the rimes of Sir Thomas Wiat, strained perchaunce out of their originall, made first by *F'rancis Petrarcha*: as these

*Like vnto these, immeasurable mountaines,  
So is my painefull life the burden of ire:  
For hie be they, and hie is my desire  
And I of teares, and they are full of fountaines.*

Where in your first second and fourth verse, ye may find a sillable superfluous, and though in the first ye will seeme to helpe it, by drawing these three sillables, (*īm mē sū*) into a *dactil*, in the rest it can not be so excused, wherefore we must thinke he did it of purpose, by the odde sillable to giue greater grace to his meetre, and we finde in our old rimes, this odde sillable, sometime placed in the beginning and sometimes in the middle of a verse, and is allowed to go alone and to hang to any other sillable. But this odde sillable in our meetres is not the halfe foote as the Greekes and Latines vsed him in their verses, and called such measure *pentimimeris* and *eptamimeris*, but rather is that, which they called the *catalectick* or maymed verse.

Their *hemimeris* or halfe foote serued not by licence Poeticall or necessitie of words, but to bewtifie and exornate the verse by placing one such halfe foote in the middle *Cesure*, and one other in the end of the verse, as they vsed all their *pentameters elegiack*: and not by coupling them together, but by accompt to make their verse of a iust measure and not defectiue or superflous: our odde sillable is not altogether of that nature, but is in a maner drowned and suppress by the flat accent, and shrinks away as it were inaudible and by that meane the odde verse comes almost to be an euen in euery mans hearing. The halfe foote of the auncients was reserued purposely to an vse, and therefore they gaue such odde sillable, wheresoeuer he fell the sharper accent, and made by him a notorious pause as in this *pentameter*.

*Nīl mī hī rēscrībīs āttāmēn īpsē vē nī.*

Which in all make fīue whole feete, or the verse *Pentameter*. We in our vulgar haue not the vse of the like halfe foote."

We need not waste the reader's time and our own with the pseudo-erudition which mixes up two widely different things, viz. the art of English verse and the classical metres of the ancients. and tries to use the latter to explain the former. So far as we know Puttenham was the first to attempt this, and his mistake has survived to our day. No trace of such confusion is found in Gascoigne and in King James<sup>1)</sup>; not even in Webbe, who thinks English verse barbarous, and wants to "reform it altogether" on the model of Greek and Latin metrical art.

---

<sup>1)</sup> If we except the misuse of the terms *short* and *long* for *unstressed* and *stressed*.

But this by the way. If in Puttenham's Chapter XVI we leave his classical lumber on one side, what remains is still a highly complicated confusion of ideas. The first thing that directly strikes us is that to Puttenham himself the "odde sillable" which he has here discovered and described, is an absolute enigma. He first calls it a beauty, then brands it as a defect, and finally describes it as in a sense a non-entity. Each of these three statements of course excludes the two others; the contradiction is an absolute one.

What does Puttenham mean by saying that his "odde sillable" is "as it were inaudible". A syllable must be either pronounced or left unpronounced. If pronounced, however weakly, it of course counts for a syllable. The way in which Puttenham fences with the question, raises the suspicion that he does not exactly know how to tackle it. Nor is it difficult to prove that he is all at sea on the point in question.

If the various kinds of verse are classified according to the number of syllables in each line, it is of course necessary to keep in mind that the last unstressed syllable or syllables of female rhymes do not count. King James actually makes this reservation twice over. On p. 69 he writes that the two verses "So moylie" and "And coylie", "have bot twa fete (= syllables!) and a tayle to ilkane of thame", and on p. 57 he says: "Sa is the hinmest lang syllabe the hinmest fute, suppose (= although) there be vther short syllabis behind it, quhilkis are eatin vp in the pronounceing, and na wayis comptit as fete".

What is meant by the metaphor "eatin vp in the pronounceing", may be gathered from what the King says immediately after this with reference to the word *Arabia*. He merely means this: If a poet in lines of ten syllables uses the words *Arabia* and *Fabia* as rhymes, we must not count

the *-bi-a* syllables as syllables of the verse-line. If we were to do this, we should get lines of twelve syllables between the decasyllabics. But we are not at liberty to count them in as regular components of the line, because these *-bi-a* syllables merely form a "tail" to the last accented syllable on which the rhyme hinges. Hinges to such a degree, that this accented syllable "eats up" (i. e. throws altogether into the shade) the rest of the syllables composing the rhyme, although of course this rest is most certainly pronounced. If for the purposes of argument we suppose for a moment that in the quadrisyllabic word *Arabia* the fourth syllable bore an accent equally strong as that of the second, in that case the fourth syllable would *not* be "eaten up" by the second, and under such circumstances the lines in question would become lines of twelve syllables. The phrase "eatin up in the pronounceing", which is so apt to give rise to misunderstanding, merely refers to the simple question of the trisyllabic rhymes, which in the old poets were of far more frequent occurrence than now, because among them might also be reckoned such rhymes as *question* — *digestion*, which King James himself actually classes as female rhymes of three syllables.

Verse-lines "in the odde", by which are meant lines of which the last accented syllable is an uneven one, i. e. the third, fifth, seventh, etc. in the line, were in bad odour with the literati of the sixteenth century. "Always tak heid", says King James on pp. 58 & 59, "that the number of zour fete (= syllables) in euery lyne be euin, and nocht odde". We have seen from our quotation from Webbe that this critic calls lines of nine syllables "a more rough or clownish manner of verse". On p. 85 of his book Puttenham says without caring to disguise his contempt: "Your

ordinarie rimers vse very much their measures in the odde as nine and eleuen, and the sharpe accent vpon the last sillable, which therefore makes him go ill fauouredly and like a minstrels musicke". The reason is that a verse "in the odde" cannot be regularly "short, long, short, long, etc.", and it was exactly this regularity that was demanded by the æsthetic ideas of the time. Puttenham, however, who repeatedly disapproves of verses "in the odde", and at the same time makes the bad mistake of always counting in the unaccented syllable of a female rhyme, so that to him all regular lines with female rhymes are also verses "in the odde", — Puttenham on p. 85 at least gives proof that he must have felt that such regular lines with female rhymes, though according to him "in the odde", could not be condemned out of hand. His defence of them runs as follows:

"And all the reason why these meeters in all sillable are allowable is, for that the sharpe accent falles vpon the *penultima* or last saue one sillable of the verse, which doth so drowne the last, as he seemeth to passe away in maner vpronounced, and so make the verse seeme euen:"

This explanation does not explain anything; of course the unaccented last syllable is always heard as a syllable, and it is absolute nonsense to pretend that it is not heard so to say. The argument is altogether the other way: the difference between female and male rhymes is so marked, that even a quite unpractised ear catches it directly, while it may be unable duly to account for the syllables that precede the rhyme. Of course it is no doubt true that such a verse seems "even", for it is "even" i. e. regular. It is "odd" only to Puttenham, because in a mechanical way he wrongly applies a system of verse-classification of which he has failed to catch the true significance. His

mistaken application of the principle of classification brings him face to face with a difficulty which he attempts to remove. The manner in which he sets to work to do so, unmistakably shows that he does not understand the matter, but at the same time leaves not the slightest doubt that his quasi-explanation is based on King James's words "quhilkis are eatin up in the pronounceing" — words which are apt to create misunderstanding, and which Puttenham has actually misunderstood.

If now we revert to Puttenham's utterances on pp. 142 & 143 (cited on pp. 57 & 58), respecting the inaudibility of the extra syllable, we see directly that they are a reiteration of what he has said on p. 85. And we now know also that it would be a mistake to attach the slightest importance to these utterances, a thing which, for the matter of that, may also be proved from the chapter itself. For he says, *inter alia*, that "this odde sillable" may occur "in the beginning and sometimes in the middle of a verse", in point of fact everywhere in the lines of "our old rimes". By "old rimes" Puttenham means old poems not consisting of stanzas, and it need not be doubtful what kinds of verse he has his eye on. We cite the first four lines of "The Tale of Gamelyn" (Skeat's *Chaucer*, IV, 645):

Litheth, and lesteneth · and herkeneth aright,  
And ye schulle heere a talking · of a doughty knight;  
Sire Iohann of Boundys · was his righte name,  
He cowde of norture y-nough · and mochil of game.

Here, indeed, the "odde sillable" occurs everywhere in the line, but it is not an "extra syllable" here. The irregular incidence of the accents, the irregular distribution of the unstressed syllables over the verse-line, are characteristic

not only of this kind of old English verse, but of well-nigh all mediæval Germanic poetry.

And it is again sheer ignorance on Puttenham's part, of this "odde syllable" he virtually says that it "shrinks away as it were inaudible and by that means the odde verse seems almost to be an even in every man's hearing".

If in conclusion we pertinently put the question what Puttenham understands by the "odde syllable", the answer must be that he mixes up three widely different sorts of syllables:

1° the unstressed syllable in the female rhymes of the 10 lines following:

Like unto these, immeasurable mountaines,  
And I of teares, and they are full of fountaines.

2° one of the syllables in the line:

So is my painefull life the burden of ire:

3° the unaccented syllables in old poems which make 3 lines irregular.

Only the second sort corresponds to the conception of extra syllable which forms the subject of this chapter. We shall try by and by to see whether the extra syllable does or does not exist in the line

So is my painefull life the burden of ire:

which Puttenham cites in illustration. For the present it suffices for us to have put it beyond doubt that in this matter Puttenham's testimony is absolutely worthless, because he stands convicted of writing about things of which no real significance was altogether beyond his grasp.

Looking away from isolated utterances, we are not aware that in the course of the seventeenth century any writer has treated English prosody of set purpose.

Let us just note in passing that in the first edition

(1653) of John Wallis's *Grammatica Linguae Anglicanae*, the fifteenth chapter, "De Poesi", opens thus:

Poesis Anglicana ut plurimum Rythmica est: ut & apud  
vicinas gentes omnes.

Observatur praesertim numerus syllabarum; non prorsus tamen  
neglecta quantitate.

Metri genera sunt varia;

Our fifth and last authority is Edward Bysshe<sup>1</sup>), who wrote in the opening years of the eighteenth century. His point of view is still the very same as that taken up by his predecessors of more than a century before him. Still the various kinds of verse are by him classified on the basis of the number of syllables in the line, and still this classification and what he observes in elucidation of it, preclude the existence of extra syllables. The whole of "Chapter I. Of the Structure of English Verses" furnishes strong evidence for what we have advanced, and may be safely recommended for attentive study. We make room here for the following quotations from it:

"The Structure of our Verses, whether Blank, or in Rhyme, consists in a certain Number of Syllables; and not in Feet compos'd of long and short Syllables, as the Verses of the Greeks and Romans" (p. 1).

"Our Verses therefore consist in a certain Number of Syllables; but the Verses of double Rhyme require a Syllable more than those of single Rhyme. Thus in a Poem, whose Verses consist of ten Syllables, those of the same Poem that are accented upon the last save one, which we call Verses of double Rhyme, must have Eleven;" (p. 2).

"In a Poem whose Verses consist of 8, the double Rhymes require 9." (p. 2).

<sup>1</sup>) The Art of English Poetry: Containing, etc. By Edw. Bysshe, Gent. London. etc. 1702.

"This must also be observ'd in Blank Verse." (p. 3.)

"Our Poetry admits for the most part but of three sorts of Verses; that is to say, of Verses of 10, 8, or 7 Syllables:" (p. 3.)

"But those of 12 and 14 Syllables are frequently inserted in our Poems in Heroick Verse," (p. 4.)

"The Verses of 10 Syllables, which are our Heroick, as us'd, *etc.*" (p. 4.)

When Bysshe refers to the insertion of Alexandrines between the Heroic lines, it should be kept in mind that he quotes largely from Dryden's poetry. But occasional Alexandrines are well known to occur in all kinds of English iambic verse; we need only mention, for instance, the line of eleven syllables that closes each stanza of Spenser's *Faerie Queene*, and the lines of the so-called Pindaric Odes, which Bysshe thus pointedly describes on p. 35:

"The Stanzas of Pindarick Odes are neither confin'd to a certain number of Verses, nor the Verses to a certain number of Syllables, nor the Rhyme to a certain Distance."

Bysshe does not say that Alexandrines occur in Blank Verse; on the contrary we read on p. 37:

"Blank Verse is where the Measure is exactly kept without Rhyme;" and no one who has read Bysshe's book can be in doubt as to his meaning, viz. that Blank Verse demands only ten syllables (*plus* an eventual unstressed eleventh one). And in strict accordance herewith Milton says with respect to his metre in *Paradise Lost*: "The measure is *English Heroic Verse without Rime*", a plain statement which obviously excludes longer and shorter lines.

In the foregoing we have gone through the statements touching English prosody made by theorists; we shall now  
v. Dam & Stoffel, Chapters. 5

go on to consider the practice of the poets in order to discover whether or not this practice tallies with the theory; *in casu* specially, whether or not there are extra syllables in the Heroic Lines.

True, one can hardly open a volume of poetry, without lighting in almost every page on verse-lines that would seem to justify the nineteenth century prosodists as against the older brethren of the craft.

If, for instance, we turn to *Ægloga sexta* of The Shepheardes Calender<sup>1)</sup> by Edmund Spenser, which consists of 120 Heroic Lines, and of which, as Webbe has informed us, each line must contain ten syllables, we find, among these 120 lines, five each of which seemingly contains an extra syllable:

- line 8: To the waters fall their tunes attemper right.
- „ 44: To giue my Rosalind, and in Sommer shade
- „ 59: Theyr yuory Luyts and Tamburins forgoe:
- „ 80: And poore my piteous plaints out in the same.
- „ 83: He, whilst he liued<sup>2)</sup>, was the soueraigne head

But these extra syllables disappear if we read *Toth'* (for *To the*), *Ros'lind*, *yv'ry*, *pit'ous* and *sou'raigne*.

In order to prove that these pronunciations were admissible at the time, we cite:

Toth Vulgar sort disloyall still, unto the better part

*J. Studley*, Hippolytus, 1581. Repr. Spenser Society, p. 131.  
Gold, band her golden hair: her yvry neck,

*Th. Hudson* in Sylvester's Folio, 1621, p. 723.

The constant faith I beare my souraine Lorde,

*F. Kinwelmarsh*e in Gascoigne, Hazlitt's Ed. Vol. I, p. 260.

*Ros'lind*, as well as *yv'ry* and *sou'raigne*, falls under the general rule, laid down by Bysshe on p. 16: "Now when in a Word of more than two Syllables, which

<sup>1)</sup> The first edition appeared in 1579. Our quotations are from the Spenser Society's reprint of 1889.

<sup>2)</sup> *liued* is a dissyllable here.

s accented upon the last save two, any of the Liquids L, M, N, or R, happen to be between two Vowels, that which preceedes the Liquid admits of an Elision". The same rule is thus given by *J. Jones, M. D. The New Art of Spelling* 1704 (First Ed. 1701) p. 70: "Note . . . That the Vowel before *l*, *n*, or *r*, in the middle of Words of three or more Syllables of a quick Run, is apt to be silent; as *cavilling*, *levillish*, *traveling*, &c. sounded *cav'ling*, *dev'lish*, *trav'ling*, &c., and in *pardoning*, *every* sounded *pard'ning*, *ev'ry*, &c. which are allow'd in Poetry, to be *written* and *sounded* the *short way*".

As regards the pronunciation *pit'ous* we likewise have Jones's evidence, who on p. 86 (and elsewhere) registers the sound *-tos* for words spelled with *-teous*. We would also remind the student that Chaucer invariably uses *pitous* for the later form *piteous*.

We may now put the question whether the printed form of the words does not furnish evidence for the extra syllables? Why, one might ask, did not the poets in every case indicate by the mode of printing what pronunciation they meant? Our answer can be a brief one. If we except writers on phonetics, not one Englishman has at any period spelled his words in the way he pronounced them. If, for example, we find *doubt* spelt with a *b*, and a trisyllabic orthography disguising the sound of such dissyllables as *business*, *Leicester*, *venison*, *victuals*, etc., etc., what right have we to ask the reason why the orthography of a few centuries back was so defective? Yes, but — it may be answered — at present every one knows perfectly well, how such words as *Leicester* and *victuals* are to be pronounced. Quite so! But three centuries ago every one also knew perfectly well how English words might or must be pronounced, and the pity of it is that the pronunciation of three

hundred years ago is forgotten now. and that the ordinary official mode of spelling proves nothing. and in point of fact never gives absolutely reliable information. As we have seen, Jones says that in Poetry it was "allow'd to write" certain words "in the short way". but of course it was by no means necessary to do so. And he who would have direct evidence of the most convincing nature in these matters, would do well just to turn over the leaves of Jones's little book. which he will find full of such questions and answers as the two following:

"When is the sound of *e* written *che*? When it may be sounded *che* as in apprehend, misapprehend, sounded apprend, misapprend." (p. 41.)

"When is the sound of *e* written *eri*? In devil, sounde<sup>d</sup> del, (as in del take you.)" (p. 43.)

And a century before Jones wrote, we have direct testimony under Ben Jonson's hand that, for instance, cases of synalephe were of frequent occurrence, without being in any way indicated by the mode of printing the words which it affected. In the first chapter of the second book of his English Grammar Ben Jonson writes:

Apostrophus is the rejecting of a Vowell from the beginning or ending of a Word. The note whereof, though it many times, through the negligence of Writers and Printers, is quite omitted, yet by right should [have], and of the learned sort hath his signe and marke, which is such a Semicircle ' placed in the top.

And, as a matter of fact, this "Semicircle" is found to be made use of in the first and second Folios of Ben Jonson's works, more than anywhere else in the printed literature of the Elizabethan and Jacobean ages. We come upon lines like the following

That did so only' embrace his countrey', and lov'd  
Folio 1616, p. 752.

which are simply invaluable for the study of "Early English Pronunciation".

If now we return to the line from *Wiat* cited by Puttenham (see *ante* p. 57):

So is my painefull life the burden of ire:

there is strong reason to assume that *burden* must be pronounced *burd*, and this would do away with the extra syllable also in this case. We have seen that Puttenham is sadly to seek in matters prosodial, and mechanically counts the syllables in the verse-line as he finds them printed, and we can therefore hardly expect that in this one case, which, if correct, would prove the existence of the extra syllable, he has for once been exceptionally accurate.

To prove the existence of the form *burd* to represent the word *burden*, we cite

And fretting at it in hir selfe said: Could this harlots burd  
Transforme the Lydian water-men, and drowne them in the foord? <sup>1)</sup>  
A. *Golding*, *Metamorphosis*, 1587, p. 57 bis & 58.

The correctness of the form *burd* at the end of the first line is put beyond doubt by the rhyme, and the meaning of the word presents no difficulty, since it Englishes the Latin substantive *natus*, used in poetry for "son", and we learn from the *New English Dictionary*, which by the way does not register the curtailed form *burd*, that *burden* was anciently used to denote "that which is borne in the womb; a child". In general our knowledge of the curtailed forms formerly in use leaves a good deal to be wished for. Such knowledge must, as matters now stand, be painfully gathered from the printed forms of the words in the first editions of the old poets, but up to now it has been the all but uni-

---

<sup>1)</sup> Nec tulit. et secum 'Potuit de pelice natus  
Vertere Mæonios, pelagoque inmergere nautas,  
Ovid. *Metamorph.* IV, 422 & 423.

versal practice to study these old poets from modernised editions, in which all sorts of characteristic peculiarities of the old language have been ruthlessly edited away. Fortunately some sort of reaction against the vandalism of modernisation has come up of late years, so that faithful reprints of the old editions are coming more and more within reach of the student, and the study of the earlier word-forms is becoming possible even outside the charmed circle of the great English libraries. The results of such a study entered upon a few years back, we have laid down in "William Shakespeare: Prosody and Text", and to this book we would refer the reader, desirous of further information on this point.

One thing, however, we must not omit to lay stress on also here. The old writers on prosody most undoubtedly refer to these shortened word-forms, though as a rule only in passing, since the matter was of course one of common knowledge at the time.

In other writers, too, we meet with utterances which most unmistakably point to the mode of pronouncing words, and which are simply unintelligible to him who knows nothing about the shortened word-forms in current use at the time. What, for instance, are we to make of Holofernes's words in L. L. L. IV 2, 123 & 124: "You find not the apostrophas, and so miss the accent", if we are without information on this point?

James Howell, in his *Instructions for forreine Travell*, 1642, thus lauds the easiness of the Spanish language (Repr. Arber, p. 39):

"being in my judgement the easiest of all Languages, by reason of the openesse, and fulnesse of pronunciation, *the agreement 'twixt the Tongue and the Text*, and the free-

dome from Apostrophes, which are the knots of a Language, as also *etc.*"

What is meant by "the agreement 'twixt the Tongue and the Text", must have become clear to the reader by this time.

Gascoigne writes on, p. 37:

"This poetically licence is a shrewde fellow, and couereth many faults in a verse, it maketh wordes longer, shorter, of mo sillables, of fewer, newer, older, truer, falsen, and to conclude it turkeneth <sup>1)</sup> all things at pleasure, for example, *ydone* for *done*, *adowne* for *dourne*, *orecome* for *ouercome*, *tane* for *taken*, *pouer* for *poure*, *heauen* for *heavn*, *theves* for good partes or good qualities, and a numbre of other whiche were but tedious and needelesse to rehearse, since your owne iudgement and readyng will soone make you espie such aduantages".

The only fault we have to find with this utterance, is that Gascoigne is wrong in calling these curtailments and expansions "poetical licences", for pretty nearly all the things he refers to are found to occur in the printed prose of his time as frequently as in its poetry.

King James says that the shorter or longer word-forms should be used according as the nature of the subject treated demands a less or more dignified diction. On pp. 62 & 63 of his "Revlis" we read:

Ze man also take heid to frame zour wordis and sentencis according to the mater: As in Flyting and Inuectiues <sup>2)</sup>, zour

---

<sup>1)</sup> *To turken* = to turn or twist about, to alter, from Old French *torquer*.

<sup>2)</sup> "*Flyting* . . . Sc. Poetical invective; chiefly, a kind of contest practised by the Scottish poets of the 16th c., in which two persons assailed each other alternately with tirades of abusive verse" (N. E. D. i. v.).

wordis to be cuttit short, and hurland ouer heuch. For ~~thais~~  
quhilkis are cuttit short, I meane be sic wordis as thir,

*Iis neir cair,*

for

*I sall neuer cair,* gif zour subiect were of loue  
or tragedies. Because in thame zour words man be drawir  
lang, quhilkis in Flyting man be short.

Ellis refers as follows to the coalition *I'se* for "I shall" (E. E. P. p. 939): "Relying on the provincialism '*se*, '*s* for *shall*— in King Lear, IV, 6, 246, and Lady Capulet's *thou's* for *thou'shalt*, which was evidently an accommodation of her language to the nurse's, Rom. & Jul. I, 3, 9, Mr. Abbott would avoid several trisyllabic measures, by reading *I'se* for *I shall*, but this does not seem advisable".

That Ellis, who is generally assumed to be the first authority on "Early English Pronunciation", is signally mistaken here, may be seen from the words of King James above cited, which show that *I'se* is king's language, and is by him considered to be on a par with *ne're* for *never*. If further proof should be wanted, we may cite William Warner's *Albion's England*, where this coalition is used in the language of the gods. Warner makes Vulcan say to Venus:

Aske whatso-else I have to give, thous maunde it for a kis.

and this line is found without change in the editions of 1589, 1592, 1597, 1602, and 1612. Let the reader also take note of the form *maunde* for *command*. And these shortened word-forms should by no means be looked upon as provincialisms or vulgarisms; they were the forms of everyday speech. It is no doubt true that many curtailed forms especially occur in the language of speakers in humble life, but this merely proves that a few writers thought it a mistake to put on the lips of such speakers still finer and more dignified language

ian they, the writers themselves, may have been in the habit of using.

Webbe does not refer to shortened word-forms, but those who should be that way inclined may find them in his poems.

Puttenham treats of these lengthened and curtailed forms in a cursory way in a separate chapter which we have cited elsewhere. As examples of shortened forms he mentions: *ixt* for *betwixt*, *gainsay* for *againesay*, *ill* for *euill*, *paraunter* for *paraurenture*, *poorety* for *pouertie*, *souraigne* for *soueraigne*, *ne* for *taken*, *morne* for *morning*, *bet* for *better*, *t'attaine* for *to attaine*, and *sor* and *smart* for *sorrow* and *smart*.

Bysshe goes into greater detail as regards the curtailment of words than any of the others, but we can make room for one very important passage only, on p. 14:

"And it is a fault to make Riot, for Example, but of one Syllable, as *Milton* has done in this Verse.

Their Riot ascends above their lofty Tow'rs."

The correct reading of this line Par. Lost I, 499 is:

Of riot ascends above thir loftiest Towrs,

but in Bysshe's day quotations were often made from memory, and without verification. Our reason for citing this passage from Bysshe's book is twofold: 1) we wish to lay stress on the fact that Milton's younger contemporary, the well-informed author of the *Art of English Poetry*, tells us that in the line in question *riot* must be sounded *ri't* in one syllable; and 2) we want to impress on our readers the warning that formerly, just as at present, most authors were in the habit of airing their own æsthetic views, and that these æsthetic theories of theirs should always be carefully distinguished from the facts they place before us. The fact here stated is that Milton syncopates the word *riot*. We

are but feebly interested to know that Bysshe disapproves of such syncopation. All nineteenth century prosodists also disapprove of it, but a duly verified fact remains what it is, whatever views we may entertain as to its beauty or ugliness. And if only the nineteenth century prosodists went no farther than Bysshe, we need not greatly care for such fault-finding. But unfortunately they go a good deal beyond Bysshe. They reason as follows: If a nineteenth century critic of poetry, a man of delicate perceptions, of undoubted judgment, and amazing knowledge, finds in Milton things which strike him as decided defects or follies, those things can never have existed. Thus, for instance, Prof. D. Masson in the preface to his well-known edition of Milton's works:

"Perhaps the elision-marks and other such devices in the old printed texts, though well intentioned, help to mislead here. When, in the original edition of *Paradise Lost*, I find *flamed* spelt *flam'd*, or *Heaven* spelt *Heav'n*, or *Thebes* spelt *Theb's*, I take the apostrophe as an express direction to omit the e-sound and pronounce the words as monosyllables; but I cannot accept the apostrophe as an elision-mark of precisely the same significance in the lines:

Above th'Aonian Mount, while it pursues (P. L. I, 15)  
That led th'imbattelld Seraphim to Warr (P. L. I, 129)

for these reasons: 1) Because the strict utterances th'Aonian and thimbattelld are comicalities now, which I cannot conceive ever to have been serious; 2) because such contracted utterances are quite unnecessary for the metre, inasmuch as the lines are perfectly good to the ear even if the word *the* is fully, but softly, uttered according to prose custom; and 3) because I find the same elision-mark used in the old texts in cases where it is utterly impossible that the total suppression of the *e* can have been meant".

Here, in the first "Because" we see modern æsthetics all swing! Prof. Masson believes in the elision-marks justly so far as his æsthetics or the æsthetics of his time allow him to do. Of course we are not at liberty to pose him ignorant of the fact that even the prose of the writers frequently exhibits the same peculiarities which strike so comical in Milton, and of which a mirth-producing specimen figures in the very title-page of John Hart's unknown booklet: "An orthographie, conteynynge the due order and reason, howe to write or paint thimage of mannes life, most like to the life or nature".

And of course all the weight of Prof. Masson's argument lies in the first "Because". For the second "because" is what it pretends to be, because it altogether lacks force, and would only leave open a possibility, *if* Prof. Masson's metrical views were correct; and the third "because" which we can hardly suppose to bear only on a small number of misprints, is couched in terms of such mysterious vagueness, that Prof. Masson himself cannot possibly have intended that earnest students as we take ourselves to be, and moreover for some years past have with unabated zeal studying the use of the apostrophe in the old printed text should *without more precise indication* make his third a subject of serious consideration.

Prof. Masson is by no means the only critic who reasons in this fashion. Strictly speaking, the modern conception of the prosody of the old poets as a whole, is based on a better than modern æsthetic views, which are apt to stand in the way of any scholarly investigation of the facts of the matter. And so long as critics refuse to see that nothing is so constant and subject to variation than æsthetic appreciation, so long as the individualism of personal taste is

not looked upon as one of the worst enemies of reason, so long our efforts to lay a better foundation for the study of Elizabethan verse will continue to be branded as egregious Quixotisms.

Profoundly conscious of the comicality of our attempt, we now go on attack another windmill.

A close study of the old pronunciation causes a large number of extra syllables to melt into thin air. But there still remains a very interesting group of seeming extra syllables that are not explained by the old pronunciation, but arise from textual corruption. In "William Shakespeare: Prosody and Text" and in the preceding chapter, we have shown that the old authors were not in the habit of correcting the proofs of their work, and that, if they were allowed to do so, they in many cases had not even a decisive voice in the ultimate redaction of their own writings. In this way not only did numerous negligences on the printer's part remain uncorrected, but it must be considered as proved beyond the shadow of a doubt that arbitrary quasi-correction of the author's text was quite a common practice of the printing-offices.

The *Ægloga decima* of Spenser's *Shepherd's Calendar* consists of 120 Heroic Lines, each of which, excepting two, contains ten syllables. [In two or three other lines we have a seeming extra syllable which disappears when the line is correctly pronounced.] The first of these two seemingly irregular lines is l. 93:

Such immortall mirrhor, as he doth admire,  
in which there are undoubtedly eleven syllables.

If, however, we think of such Shakespearean phrases as the following: *so profound abysm* Sonn. 112, 9; *so full soul* Tp. III, 1, 44; *so quick condition* M. for M. I, 1, 54

*so strict account* I H 4. III, 2, 149; *so flood-gate and o'er-bearing nature* O. 1, 3, 56; and at the same time keep our eye on the mode of printing exhibited in the following quotations:

Mary, to be so' importunate for one,

*Ben Jonson*, Folio 1616, p. 612.

I could not thinke my Lord would be s'unkind,

*S. Daniel*, Folio 1623, p. 2.

Two things s'averse, they never yet

But in thy rambling fancy met.

*S. Butler*, *Hudibras*, I Part, 1663, p. 268.

then it is certainly within the bounds of possibility that in his manuscript Spenser may have written *So*, or *So'*, or *S'* instead of *Such*. If this was the case, *Such* is a corruption made by the printer; it might be a case of simple inadvertence on his part, or a quasi-correction which substituted the more common *such* for the less usual *so*.

But it must be clear to every reader that, however plausible this solution of the difficulty may appear, it only opens up a possibility requiring further proof before it can become a certainty. And it is equally evident, that where the cogent requirements of the metre are not held to furnish absolute proof, no such absolute proof can be given about this line 93, unless in the highly unlikely case that Spenser's own manuscript of the tenth *Ægloga* should be recovered. Now with the great majority of textual corruptions matters stand exactly as they stand with respect to this line. But fortunately there remains a small number of such corruptions in the case of which the corruptness is self-evident, because the text as it stands is unmitigated nonsense. Such a case we have in line 105 of the *Ægloga decima*, viz. the third line of the

Who euer casts to compasse weightye prise,  
 And thinks to throwe out thondring words of threate:  
 Let powre in lauish cups and thriftie bitts of meate,  
 For *Bacchus* fruite is frend to *Phoebus* wise.  
 And when with Wine the braine begins to sweate,  
 The numbers flowe as fast as spring doth ryse.

We see that line 105 has two undoubted extra syllables, and that the "pouring in of thrifty bits of meat" constitutes extra nonsense into the bargain.

What, we must now ask, can Spenser have written here?

The "Glosse", which is of course Spenser's own work though signed with the initials E. K., says:

"Lauish cups) Resembleth that comen verse *Fæcundi calices quem non fecere disertum*".

This makes it sure that the corruption of the text must be sought in the words following *cups*. The rhyme *meate: threate: sweate* puts it beyond a doubt that the rhyme-word *meate* is genuine. The corruption must accordingly be in the words *and thriftie bitts of*, which constitute five syllables where only three can have their place. And this enables us to solve the riddle, for there can be little doubt after this that Spenser wrote:

Let poure in lauish cups and thriftlie meate,

This solution is all the more sure because — and this is a point of supreme importance in judging of the value of emendations — the restored text clearly shows the printer's motive for tampering with it. The printer did not understand the last two words: he did not know the rare verb *to meat*<sup>1</sup>), or did not think of it at the time, mistook it for a noun, and for the words *thriftlie meate*, which he thought

---

<sup>1</sup>) Cf. *Chapman*, Homer's *Iliad* XIX, 196: *Haste then, and meate your men*; *Tusser*, *September's Husbandry*: *Strong oxen and horses, well shod and well clad, Wel meated and used.*

nonsense, substituted *thriftie bitts of meate*. This is a capital example, not of thoughtless blundering on the printer's part, but of the quasi-improving on the author's text, which entered so largely into the practice of the printing-offices, three centuries ago.

We have elsewhere satisfactorily disposed of the hypothesis that such corruptions should be laid at the door of the transcriber, and besides, so far as our present subject is concerned, the question how the corruptions have arisen is of hardly any importance.

We have thus shown that part of the so-called extra syllables are practically non-existent, because they disappear as soon as the words are pronounced according to the practice of the time, and that another part of them might be accounted for by supposing corruption of the author's text.

The question now naturally presents itself whether *all* extra syllables can be accounted for in these two manners. In order to answer this question, we shall not, of course, have to go through the whole body of poetry in Heroic Lines and in Blank verse. It will be sufficient for our purpose to subject to a careful scrutiny those lines which by nineteenth century authorities are held to contain extra syllables, or are by them regularly cited as evidence for the existence of such extra syllables. But, even if we were thus to circumscribe the task before us, the present chapter would swell to the dimensions of a respectable volume, without yielding proportionate profit to the student. We shall therefore have to narrow our field of investigation to a somewhat large number of examples taken at random. Among nineteenth century authorities we choose six representative scholars, four of them Englishmen and two Germans. We do not think that our selection of Guest,

Abbott, Ellis, Mayor, König, and Schipper (see *ante* p. 50) can in reason be found fault with.

As regards the place in the line of the alleged extra syllable, we choose the one that is most apt to attract the reader's attention, viz. the extra syllable quite at the beginning of the line, before the first accented syllable. We shall accordingly examine *all* the verse-lines in which according to the six authorities mentioned, two unaccented syllables are found to precede the first accented syllable. The Germans are accustomed to call such lines verses "mit doppelt<sup>em</sup> Auftakt". English writers on prosody are in the habit of saying that in lines of this class the first measure is trisyllabic. When, however the trisyllabic measure is an evident so-called amphibrach, we leave the lines in which it occurs undiscussed, because in this case to our thinking the extra syllable must be held to stand between the first and the second accented syllable of the line. On the other hand, we include in our investigation those verses of which the first measure is a so-called dactyl, although of course such lines are not verses "mit doppelt<sup>em</sup> Auftakt".

We cite the alleged evidential lines in the chronological order of their publication. Several lines are treated by more than one authority. To avoid repetitions we place before the line cited the capital initial (G for Guest, etc.) of the name of the authority who cites the line. The lines are provided with a running number to facilitate subsequent reference. Sh. stands for Shakespeare.

If we should be found to have passed over a line of this class cited by any of the writers mentioned, such omission is quite unintentional. We mention this, because an oversight of this kind may easily occur where the lines we are

concerned with are found scattered all over the works on prosody we have had to consult.

1. G., & M.

We may boldly spend upon the hope of what

*Sh.* I H 4. IV, 1, 54.

This line is not a verse of Shakespeare's, but one of Steevens's fabrications. In the only authoritative text of I Henry 4. which we possess, viz. the Quarto of 1598, the text stands thus:

Where now remains a sweet reuersion,

We may boldly spend vpon the hope of what tis to come in,  
A comfort of retirement liues in this.

The Folio of 1623 cuts up the second of these three lines into two short lines, of which the second begins with *of*; the Folio moreover replaces the misprint *tis* by *is*. But the Folio text of I H 4. is absolutely without value, since it is a mere reprint of the Quarto text. (See William Shakespeare: Prosody and Text, pp. 328 ff.).

The second line of our extract from the Quarto is of course corrupt, for, apart from metrical grounds, the words *of what is to come in* do not fit in with the style of the whole passage, as will be more clearly seen on consulting the context. Shakespeare must have written the three lines thus:

Where now remains a sweet reversion, we

May boldly spend upon the hope to come;

A comfort of retirement lives in this.

The phrase *hope to come* of course in all respects equals the phrase *future hopes* in Gent. I, 1, 50. It is exactly parallel with the well-known expression *time to come*, which in its turn is equivalent to *future time*. The motive that induced the corruption is quite plain; the printer thought

it necessary to replace the less usual phrase by a more common one, a motive that underlies numerous alterations made in texts.

As regards the motivation of the line-shifting, i. e. faulty delimitation of lines, we must refer the student to W. Sh. Pros. & Text, pp. 293—301. We would only observe here that line-shifting is one of the most common things in the texts of the old dramas, and where it occurs, the line is frequently made to come to an untimely end *at* a pause, of which the Quarto text above cited furnishes a good example.

2. G., E., M., & K.

In election for the Roman empery,

Sh. T. A. I, 1, 22.

Pronounce *lection* instead of *election*. Dr. Jones says that words beginning with *el-* may be pronounced without the *e*. The best-known instance of this is '*leven* for *eleven*.'

3. G.

In a chariot of inestimable value

Sh. Pericles II, 4, 7½—1/8.

This line is one of Steevens's making. The Quarto of 1609, our only authoritative text, reads:

*Hell.* No Escanes, know this of mee,  
Antiochus from incest liued not free:  
For which the most high Gods not minding,  
Longer to with-hold the vengeance that  
They had in store, due to this heynous  
Capitall offence, euen in the height and pride  
Of all his glory, when he was seated in  
A Chariot of an inestimable value, and his daughter  
With him; a fire from heauen came and shriued  
Vp those bodyes euen to lothing, for they so stounke,  
That all those eyes ador'd them, ore their fall,  
Scorne now their hand should giue them buriall.

Steevens's arrangement of these lines has been pretty generally given up now. The Cambridge Editors have

opted another arrangement, which is the result of the  
 nt efforts of Malone and Dyce. But in our opinion the  
 t should stand as follows here:

*Hel.* No, Escanes, know this of me, Antiochus  
 From incest lived not free: for which, the most  
 High gods not minding longer to withhold  
 The vengeance that they had in store, due tó  
 This heinous capital offence, e'n in  
 The height and pride of all his glory, when  
 H'was seated in a chariot of an  
 Inestimable value', and 's daughter with him,  
 A fire from heaven came, and shrivelled up<sup>1)</sup>  
 Their bodies, e'n to loathing, for they só stunk,  
 That all those eyes adored them ere their fall  
 Scorn now their hand should give them burial.

We shall not dwell more at large on this point, because,  
 atever one may think of the text proposed by us, it must  
 clear to every one that the line cited by Guest cannot  
 brought forward as evidence for the existence of the  
 tra syllable, since for the line in question there is no  
 thority whatever.

4. G.

He shall ha' the grograns at the rate I told him

*Ben Jonson, Folio 1616, p. 18.*

Pronounce *Hese* for *He shall*; see p. 72 *ante*. Though  
 have not hitherto lighted on the form *hese* in print, it  
 impossible to doubt its existence, since we have printed  
 dence for *Ise*, *thouse* and *wese*, and *theyse* is also certain;  
 3 W. Sh. Pros. & Text, p. 147.

5. G.

'Tis a wonder by your leave she will be tamed so.

*Sh. Shrew V, 2, 189.*

---

<sup>1)</sup> Just as possible, however, we consider the following arrange-  
 nt:

Inestimable value, and his daughter  
 With him, a fire of hea'n came and shri'll'd up

This line does not belong either to Heroic or to Blank verse, the last lines of *The Taming of the Shrew* being written in tumbling verse.

## 6. G.

From a well-experienced archer hits the mark  
*Sh.* Pericles I, 1, 164.

This line has been made up by Malone. The Quarto of 1609 gives the passage in prose thus:

Because we bid it: say, is it done?

*Thali.* My Lord, tis done.

*Anti.* Enough. Let your breath coole your selfe, telling your haste.

*Mess.* My Lord, Prince Pericles is fled.

*Antin.* As thou wilt liue flie after, and like an arrow shot from a well experienst Archer hits the marke his eye doth leuell at: so thou neuer returne vnlesse thou say Prince Pericles is dead.

*Thal.* My Lord, if I can get him within my Pistols length, Ile make him sure enough, so farewell to your highnesse.

Re-arranged so as to represent the original blank verse, the passage must stand thus:

Because we bid it. Say, is't done?

*Thal.*

My lord,

'Tis done.

*Ant.* 'Nough. — Let your breath cool yóurself, telling Your haste.

*Mess.* My lord, Prince Pericles is fled.

*Ant.* As thou wilt live, fly after: and like an Arrow shôt frôm a well experienced archer Hitteth the mark his eye doth level at, So thou nevér return unless thou say 'Prince Pericles is dead'.

*Thal.*

My lord, if I can

Get him within my pistol's length, I'll make

Him sure enough: so, farewell to your highness.

Dr. Jones says that *enough* is often sounded *nough*. We have put a few stress-marks where syllabic and sentence

stress show deviations from modern usage. Considerations of space do not allow us here to argue questions of accentuation.

## 7. G., &amp; K.

Who did hoot him out o'th' city.

Com.

But I fear

Sh. Cor. IV, 6, 123.

Shakespeare wrote *Who hoot him*, using *hoot* for *hooted*. The matter is one of common knowledge. See Abbott, §§ 341 & 342. The printer elucidates the line by interpolating *did*.

## 8. A.

I beseech your majesty, give me leave to go;

Sh. II H 6. II, 3, 20.

Read *seech* for *beseech*. Though we have not hitherto met with the form '*seech*' in print, there can be no doubt of the admissibility of this pronunciation, on account of the very numerous analogies with words beginning with *be-*, and dropping this prefix at the speaker's option. At the same time it is just possible, however, that the printer has interpolated *I*, for see Tp. I, 2, 473; II, 1, 1; etc., etc.

## 9. A., E., &amp; S.

I beseech your graces both to pardon me;

Sh. R 3. I, 1, 84.

As above.

## 10. A.

I beseech your grace to pardon me, and withal

Sh. R 3. I, 1, 103.

As above. The Quarto of 1597 and the Folio of 1623 have line-shiftings here which are different in the two authoritative texts. Moreover, the Folio printer has interpolated *do* between *I* and *beseech*. Capell has set the lines right, but it goes without saying that Capell's emendation cannot do duty as evidence.

## 11. A.

Let me see, let me see; is not the leaf turn'd down?

Sh. J. C. IV, 3, 273.

Pronounce in both cases *le'm'* instead of *let me*. Compare for instance

Cóme let's be gone.

Sub.

Pray you, le'me speake with you.

Ben Jonson, Folio 1616, p. 612.

## 12. A.

To no sight but thine and mine; invisible

Sh. Tp. I, 2, 302.

The line is Malone's; the Folio of 1623, the only authoritative text of *The Tempest*, reads:

*Pro.* Goe make thy selfe like a Nymph o'th' Sea, \*

Be subiect to no sight but thine, and mine: inuisible

To euery eye-ball else: goe take this shape

We have elsewhere set forth our opinion regarding these lines, and would here only observe that no emendations of the text can ever be cited in evidence of anything connected with prosody.

## 13. A., &amp; K.

Which most gibingly, ungravely, he did fashion

Sh. Cor. II, 3, 233.

Connect this with the preceding line, thus:

Th' apprehension of his present portance, which

Most gibingly, ungravely he did fashion

Grant White has set right the line-shifting of the Folio, but retained *The apprehension*. For the shortened form proposed by us, see Jones's rule on p. 68 *ante*.

## 14. A.

I had thought, by making this well known unto you,

Sh. Lear, I, 4, 224.

Pronounce *I'd* for *I had*; compare

*Mol.* Now are you gull'd as you would be, thanke me for't,  
I'de a fore-finger in't.

*Seb.* Forgiue mee father,  
*Middleton & Dekker*, Roaring Girle, Repr. Pearson Vol. III, p. 229.

## 15. A.

We have with a leaven'd and prepared choice

*Sh. M.* for *M. I*, 1, 52.

Pronounce *we have* as *w'have*; compare

Is well! The clothes we'haue now: But, where's this Lady?

*Ben Jonson*, Second Folio, Asse, p. 127.

In this line *clothes* is of course a monosyllable. The following instance is still clearer:

W'hear, in This Case, no Conscience-Cases holier.

*Sylvester*, Folio 1621, p. 1132.

## 16. A.

I have sixty sails: Cæsar none better.

*Sh. A. & C. III*, 7, 50.

We look upon this line as indubitably corrupt. The Cambridge Editors register five different attempts at emendation, and we might add another couple ourselves, if we did not think it absolutely nugatory to do so. Since the line is a syllable short, it can of course never do duty as evidence for the extra syllable.

## 17. A.

You have done our pleasures much grace, fair ladies,

*Sh. T.* of *A. I*, 2, 151.

For *you have* read *you've* as the Folio of 1623 has in *C. II*, 1, 237, or *y'have* as the same Folio reads in *3. II*, 3, 107. *Fair* is here a dissyllable *faiër*.

## 18. A.

Is he pardon'd; and, for your lovely sake,

*Sh. M.* for *M. V*, 1, 496.

Read *'s he* for *Is he*; *your* is a dissyllable here *youër*, also Abbott assumes. For *'s* at the beginning of the line compare

And that an Eye, a No, a Not, a Nick,  
 's enough t' offend a Noble sence and quick.  
*Sylvester*, Folio 1621, p. 855.

## 19. A., &amp; K.

At a poor man's house: he us'd me kindly.  
*Sh. Cor. I*, 9, 83.

The line is correct if we read *mannēs* as two syllables ;  
 the occurrence of this seeming archaism in Shakespeare's ~~time~~  
 time is put beyond doubt, *inter alia* in Gil's *Logonomia* ~~Anglica~~  
*Anglica*. (See *W. Sh. Pros. & Text*, p. 8.)

## 20. A.

Go to the creating a whole tribe of fops,  
*Sh. Lear, I*, 2, 14.

Pronounce *to the* as *to th'*, as we find actually printed ~~in~~  
 in the Folio of 1623.

## 21. A.

To offend and judge are distinct offices  
*Sh. M. of V. II*, 9, 61.

Pronounce of course *t'offend*; see a few lines higher up.

## 22. A.

O'the plague, hee's safe, from thinking toward London.  
*Ben Jonson*, Folio 1616, p. 610.

Pronounce *o'the* as *o'th'*. Compare *o'th' Sea* in the  
 quotation from the Folio, *Tp. I*, 2, 301, on p. 86 *ante*.

## 23. A.

Upon the sisterhood, the votarists of St. Clare.  
*Sh. M. for M. I*, 4, 5.

Abbott rightly assumes that in this line it is legitimate  
 to pronounce *upon* as *'pon*. The following article thus coa-  
 lesces with the preposition *'po(n)th'*; in proof of which we cite:

they sweare they'll bring your life & death upon'th stage  
*Dekker*, *Untrussing of Hum. Poet. Repr. Pearson Vol. I*, p. 195.  
 Wee'l charge him uppo'th backe sir.  
*Middleton & Dekker*, *Roaring Girle. Repr. Pearson Vol. III*, p. 191.

*Votarists* of course pronounced *vo'trists* in accordance with the general rule.

## 24. A.

Unto a poor but worthy gentleman: she's wedded:

*Sh. Cym. I, 1, 7.*

Abbott here follows Capell's emendation, who reads *to* instead of *unto*. This is probably quite correct, but in addition to this it is necessary to read *t'a* for *to a*, as found printed in:

Threatning to chastize me, as doth t'a chylde pertaine.

*Spenser, F. Q. Repr. Spens. Soc. VI, 2, 104.*

## 25. A.

He is my brother too. But fitter time for that.

*Sh. M. for M. V, I, 498.*

Abbott already reads *He's*. The correct reading is *he's* *mý bró'r too*. All such words as *brother*, *either*, *rather*, etc. are frequently found in positions where the metre requires for them monosyllabic pronunciation. Hitherto we have found in print only the well-known *where* for *hether*. But the shortened form of *thither* too is beyond doubt, since in Owen Price's Table of the Difference between Words of Like Sound, 1668, *thither*, *there*, *their* are coordinated as regards pronunciation. Compare also the modern conjunction *or*, which is a contraction of *other*, *whether*, etc., the older forms.

## 26. E., &amp; S.

Barren winter, with his wrathful nipping cold:

*Sh. II H 6. II, 4, 3.*

Pronounce *barren* as *bare*; the printer has set up a wrong word-form, as occurs hundreds of times in the old texts. There is also the possibility that *barren* was pronounced *bar'n*, as is assumed by others. We hold *bare* to be

the more probable reading, for compare *bare fallow* M. folio M. I, 4, 42, and *age like winter bare* Pilgr. 160.

27. E., & S.

Having God, her conscience, and these bars against me,  
Sh. R 3. I. 2. 235.

Pronounce *having* as *ha'ng*. All verbs of one syllable ending in a vowel, may syncopate *i* in the present participle. This is often found indicated in print, *e. g.* *be'ng* J. Taylor, Folio 1630, Repr. Spens. Soc. p. 46; *know'ng* S. Daniel, Folio 1623, Civ. Wares, IV, 42, 7; *play'ng* Jos. Sylvester, Folio 1621, p. 1051; *prayng*, J. Heywood, Troas, Repr. Spens. Soc. p. 198; *see'ng* S. Daniel, Folio 1623, p. 45; *stray'ng* Ben Jonson, Folio 1616, p. 910, etc. The verbs *to have* and *to give* also fall under this rule, for, as readers will remember, the phonetic forms *ha'* and *gi'* are of frequent occurrence.

28. E.

Naught to do with Mistress Shore! I tell thee, fellow,  
Sh. R 3. I. 1, 98.

Leave out *with*, since this word is an interpolation of the printer's. Comp. *Sh. Lucrece* 1092:

For day hath nought to do what's done by night.

29. E., & S.

By your power legatine, within this kingdom,  
Sh. H 8. III, 2, 339.

Pronounce *By yóur pow'r*.

30. E.

Either heav'n with lightning strike the murderer dead,  
Sh. R 3, I, 2, 64.

Pronounce *either* as *eí'r* (see *supra*), and *murd'rer* for *murderer*. The last word of course follows the general rule which we have repeatedly referred to.

31. E.

My surveyor is false; the o'ergreat cardinal

Sh. H 8, 1, 1, 222.

Read and scan:

My súrveyór is fálse; the ó'ergreat cárd'nal

Want of space prevents us from citing parallels to the usual accents. The syncopation *card'nal* follows the well-known general rule.

32. E., & S.

To oppose your cunning, you're meek and humble-mouth'd

Sh. H 8. II, 4, 107.

Pope reads here:

And to say so no more.

*Q. Kath.*

My lord, my lord, I am

A simple woman, much too weak t'oppose

Your cunning. You are meek and humble-mouth'd;

and this is probably correct, for the pronunciation *m'lord* or *my lord*, though we have not hitherto met it in print, quite sure in our opinion. For nineteenth century usage compare *Dickens*, *Bleak House*, ch. I:

Thus, in the midst of the mud and at the heart of the fog, sits Lord High Chancellor in his High Court of Chancery.

'Mr. Tangle', says the Lord High Chancellor, latterly something restless under the eloquence of that learned gentleman.

'*My lord*', says Mr. Tangle. Mr. Tangle knows more of Jarndyce than anybody. He is famous for it — supposed never have read anything else since he left school.

'Have you nearly concluded your argument?'

'*My lord*', no — variety of points — feel it my duty duty to submit — *My lord* is the reply that slides out of Mr. Tangle.

However this may have been in Elizabethan usage, in every case we shall have to read *t'oppose*, and that is the point in question here.

## 33. E., &amp; S.

To the discontented members, the mutinous parts  
*Sh. Cor. I, 1, 115.*

Read *toth'* for *to the*, a point that we have already treated; and *th'mut'nous* for *the mutinous*, for *mut'nous* is in accordance with the general rule, and for the synalephe of *the* before *m* we cite:

Th' moralitie of which. is that his knowledge drew  
*Drayton, The Poly-Olbion, Repr. Spens. Soc., p. 357.*

## 34. E.

Given to captivity me, and my utmost hope  
*Sh. O. IV, 2, 51.*

Pronounce *gi'n* for *given*; *captiv'ty* for *captivity*, and *m'utmost* for *my utmost*. *Given* and *Heaven* very frequently figure in print as monosyllables, with the forms *giv'n* and *Heav'n*. That in this case *v* was not pronounced, is proved by rhymes, so far as the second word is concerned; as regards *giv'n* we might simply refer the reader to what we have set forth in connection with *ha'ng* for *having* on p. 90, but we have also found *gin* in print:

Me in the care, when Turfe had gi'n me his key,  
*Ben Jonson, Second Folio, Tub p. 97.*  
 .... had you gin't him, I should have tane you for the Master.  
*Th. Heywood, A Chall. for Beauty. Repr. Pearson, Vol. V, p. 14.*

There need be no doubt as to *captiv'ty*, if we remember that *charty* for *charity* occurs in Ben Jonson, Tub p. 72, Second Folio.

In support of *m'utmost* we cite:

When I vile wretch, whil'st m'answere he attends,  
*S. Daniel, Folio 1623, p. 247.*  
 But for m'intents sake, and my loue to Truth,  
*G. Wither, Juvenilia. Repr. Spens. Soc. p. 442.*

## 35. E.

To the king I'll say't, and make my vouch as strong  
*Sh. H 8. I, 1, 157.*

Read, *ut supra*, *toth'* for *to the*; also in the following line:

## 36. E.

To the water side I must conduct your grace;  
*Sh. H 8. II, 1, 95.*

## 37. M.

To betray the heady husbands rob the easy  
*Ben Jonson, Cat. III, 3.*

Prof. Mayor's reading of the line is wrong; read with the Folio 1616, p. 723:

To betray headie husbands; rob the easie:

Accent *bétray*. The next line is rightly cited by Guest as an instance of the dropping of the *be*-prefix.

## 38. M.

O belike his majesty hath some intent  
*Sh. R 3. I, 1, 49.*

## 39. M.

Knowing who I am as I know who thou art  
*Milton, P. R. I, 356.*

With full justice Guest cites this line as one in which the vowel of an unaccented syllable is dropped, if it is immediately preceded by the vowel of the accented syllable. See p. 90 *ante*.

## 40. M.

No ungrateful food: and food alike those pure  
*Milton, P. L. V, 407.*

Correctly cited by Guest as a case of synalephe; compare for instance:

Suspect her truth: yet since no' vntruth he knew,  
*Spenser, F. Q. I, 1, 479. Repr. Spens. Soc.*

## 41. M.

Ominous conjecture on the whole success:  
*Milton, P. L. II, 123.*

Guest aptly observes: "if a critic of Tyrwhitt's reputation did not know that *ominous* . . . (is) to be pronounced *om'-nous*, can we fairly expect such knowledge to flash, as it were by intuition, on the uninstructed reader?" And we grieve to say that since Guest wrote, the information possessed by the so-called well-instructed authorities has gone sadly backward.

## 42. M.

Erebus the grisly, and Chaos huge  
Surrey, *Æneid*, IV, 684.

Mayor here looks upon *grisly* as a trisyllable, and takes the first "foot" to be a trisyllabic one. But the whole line has the normal number of 10 syllables; only the stressed syllables are irregularly distributed over the line, as is frequently the case in Surrey, who in this respect imitates Italian models; see W. Sh. Pros. and Text, ch. XII.

## 43. M., &amp; S.

To revenge my town, unto such ruin brought;  
Surrey, *Æneid*, II, 755.

Pronounce *t'revenge*; see, for instance:

So much t'release the homage as suffic'd,  
Drayton, *The Barrons Warres*, IV, 7, 1.

## 44. M.

Doth Creusa live, and Ascanius thy son?  
Surrey, *Æneid*, II, 786.

Pronounce *Créuse* in two syllables, just as in line II, 1023, where the word stands printed *Creuse*.

## 45. M.

In the void porches, Phoenix, Ulysses eke  
Surrey, *Æneid*, II, 1014.

We are probably to read *porches* as *porch*. In this case, however, there are also other possibilities. We may read

*i'th'*, by which the line gets the regular number of syllables, though at the same time the accents, as in No. 42 higher up, are, in the Italian way, irregularly distributed over the verse.

## 46. M.

Bid economy farewell and Gallen come

*Marlowe, Faustus, l. 40.*

Here is a palmary instance of editorial bungling. The line, as it stands here, is unmitigated nonsense. The editio princeps of 1604, however, reads:

Bid Oncaymaeon farewell, Galen come

The uncouth-looking word of course represents *ὄν καὶ γὰρ ὄν*, which makes excellent sense. The third edition, of 1619, however, has the two corruptions above shown, so that Prof. Mayor is enabled to cite a beautiful so-called "anapæst", and to father the same on Marlowe.

## 47. M.

Shadowing more beauty in their airy brows

*Marlowe, Faustus, l. 156.*

Pronounce of course *shad'ing*. Bysshe says on p. 17 that the "Gerunds of the verbs in OW" may be syncopated, "as Foll'wing, Wall'wing, etc."

## 48. M., &amp; K.

What a haste looks through his eyes! So should he look

*Sh. Mac. I, 2, 46.*

The article *a* is an interpolation of the printer's. The mistake is already found corrected in the second Folio of 1632.

## 49. M.

Ay, or drinking, fencing, swearing, quarrelling,

*Sh. Ham. II, 1, 25.*

The line is Capell's. Both the Quarto and the Folio

texts end the line with the word *swearing*. It cannot therefore do duty as evidence for the extra syllable. In the authentic line the number of syllables is under ten.

We incline to the belief that somewhere about this line the printer has again been making interpolations on his own account, and that the genuine text must have run as follows:

To youth and liberty.

*Rey.* As gaming, —

*Pol.* Ay,

Or drinking, fencing, swearing, quarrelling,

Drabbing, —

*Rey.* My lord, that would dishonour him!

50. M.

The observed of all observers, quite, quite down!

*Sh. Ham. III, 1, 162.*

Of course we should pronounce *th'observed*.

51. M.

To o'ertop old Pelion, or the skyish head

*Sh. Ham. V, 1, 276.*

Of course pronounce *To'retop*, as we find actually printed in the authoritative Quarto. Apostrophes were often omitted by the old printers. (*Pelion* should be pronounced *Felon*.)

52. M.

Carrying. I say, the stamp of one defect

*Sh. Ham. I, 4, 31.*

Pronounce *carr'ing*; in proof of which we cite:

To which these carr'ings on did tend?

*Butler, Hudibras, I Part, 1663, p. 114.*

53. M.

Bestial oblivion, or some craven scruple

*Sh. Ham. IV, 4, 40.*

*Bestial* should here be pronounced *best'al*, and *oblivion*, *liv'on*. The matter is absolutely beyond doubt, as we all prove in the next chapter.

54. M.

Dangerous conjectures in ill-breeding minds.

*Sh. Ham. IV, 5, 15.*

Pronounce *dang'rous* of course; the word follows the le repeatedly referred to.

55. M.

Myriads though bright, if he whom mutual league

*Milton, P. L. I, 87.*

Pronounce *myr'ads* and *mut'al*. Evidence to be given sewhere, see *supra* No. 53.

56. M.

The Apocalypse, heard cry in Heaven aloud

*Milton, P. L. IV, 2.*

Pronounce *Th'Apocalyps*, as we actually find the words inted in the editio princeps of 1667.

57. M.

No advantage, and his strength as oft assay.

*Milton, P. Reg. II, 234.*

Pronounce *n'advantage*; compare, for instance,

Since it prevents n'insuing harmes,

*Habington, Castara, Arber's Repr. p. 44.*

58. K.

I was forced to scold. Your judgements, my grave lords,

*Sh. Cor. V, 6, 106.*

59. K.

I was moved withal.

*Cor*

I dare be sworn you were:

*Sh. Cor. V, 3, 194.*

60. K.

I was sure your lordship did not give it me.

*Sh. J. C. IV, 3, 254.*

From the three lines just cited, and from similar cases in other dramatists, we think ourselves justified in inferring that *I was* was contracted to *I's*, but we have not hitherto met with this coalition in print. He who is familiarly acquainted with analogous coalitions of this nature, would be more astonished to find that it did not, than that it did exist. Nor is it difficult to account for its non-occurrence in printed books: *I's* might be mistaken for *I shall*; besides, *'s* was already in use to represent *as, his, is, this, and us*. Printers may well have scrupled to add to the confusion.

## 61. K.

Or we'll burst them open, if that you come not quickly

*Sh. I H 6. I, 3, 28.*

The stress should be on *we'll* and *them*, and *open* should be left out, since it is an evident interpolation of the printer's. *Ham. I. 4, 48* and other passages show that *open* is quite superfluous here.

## 62. K.

Till this madman show'd thee? and what art thou now?

*Sh. L. L. L. V, 2, 338.*

The stress should be on *man* and on *thee*, and the superfluous word *thou* be left out according to Keightley's correction. *Thou* should also be omitted from the following line, as proposed by Pope.

## 63. K.

Art thou certain this is true? is it most certain?

*Sh. Cor. V, 4, 47.*

## 64. K.

For a second course of fight.

*Mar.*

Sir praise me not;

*Sh. Cor. I, 5, 17.*

Read according to Capell's arrangement:

Thy exercise hath been too vile for

A second, etc.

65. K.

If I chance to talk a little wild, forgive me;

*Sh. H 8. I, 4, 26.*

The word *to* is an interpolation of the Folio printer's. Compare Tr. & Cr. I, 1, 26, where the older Quarto of 1599 reads *chance burn*, and the younger Folio of 1623 reads *chance to burn*. The use of the noun *chance* as an adverb in the sense of "by chance, perchance, haply" has lived down to our day. Compare *Sh. II H 4. II, 1, 12*: It may chance cost some of us our lives; *Swift, Battle of the Clouds*, 265: If chance her Geese be scatter'd over the common; *Byron, Ch. Harold IV, LXVII*: While, chance, she scatter'd water-lily sails

66. K.

She's a stranger now again.

*Anne.*

So much the more

*Sh. H 8. II, 3, 17.*

The printer has interpolated *a*; *stranger* is an adjective, as it often is. The correction is made already in the old Folio.

67. K.

I were best not call; I dare not call: yet famine,

*Sh. Cym. III, 6, 19.*

68. K.

I were best to leave him, for he will not hear.

*Sh. I H 6. V, 3, 82.*

the two lines just given the coalition *I're* for *I were* is probable, but we have not hitherto found it figured. We must not, however, omit to point out another error, viz. that *I* is an interpolation; compare for

*Term.* Thanke you, Madame, but 'will not sing.

*Ben Jonson, Folio 1616, p. 292.*

where the apostrophe takes the place of the pronoun *I*, which is left out according to common usage. In the line following the apostrophe stands for pronoun (you) + auxiliary verb:

'Best raise the house upon him, to secure us;  
*Ben Jonson*, Second Folio, *Lady*, p. 29.

For nineteenth century American usage, compare *Stockton*, *Rudder Grange*, p. 240: I tell ye what ye better do; *Pall Mall Mag.* Oct. 1899, 192: Mr. Howells' Willis Campbell, a witty and cultivated Bostonian, says, in *The Albany Dépôt*, 'I guess we better get out of here'.

## 69. K.

He was paid for that: though mean and mighty, rotting  
*Sh. Cym.* IV, 2, 246.

Pronounce *H'was*, which is found printed thus in

*H'was* very shie of using it,  
*Butler*, *Hudibras*, 1 Part, 1663, p. 4.

## 70. K.

Stay a little while. You're welcome: what's your will?  
*Sh. M. for M.* II, 2, 26.

*Little* is the printer's word for the archaic *lite*.

## 71. K.

As all comforts are; most good, most good indeed.  
*Sh. M. for M.* III, 1, 55.

Pronounce 's *all* for *as all*, as found printed, for instance in

The blast of Envy flies as lowe 's the ground.  
*Wither*, *Juvenilia*, Repr. Spens. Soc. p. 75.

## 72. K.

We'll along ourselves and meet them at Philippi.  
*Sh. J. C.* IV, 3, 225.

*Along* should be pronounced 'long; see Jones.

73. K.

We must talk in secret: — nurse, come back again;  
*Sh. R. & J. I, 3, 8.*

74. K.

She's not fourteen.  
*Nurse.* I'll lay fourteen of my teeth,  
*Sh. R. & J. I, 3, 12.*

75. K.

Of my dug, and felt it bitter, pretty fool,  
*Sh. R. & J. I, 3, 31.*

The three lines last cited are printed as prose in the authoritative text, and cannot therefore be considered as evidence. All the same, the verse-lines restored by Capell are irreproachable, if we remember that *we must* is a printer's correction of frequent occurrence for the *we'se* that must have been in the manuscript; that in both cases *fourteen* must be accented on the second syllable; and that, also in both cases, *of my* should be pronounced as *o'm'* in one syllable. We need not set forth our grounds for the assertions just made, since, as we have said, the lines have no evidential force.

76. K.

God-a-mercy, old heart! thou speak'st cheerfully.  
*Sh. H 5. IV, 1, 34.*

Pronounce *God'mercy*; in support of which omission of worn-down small unstressed words we point to the analogy of the well-known *father-law*, and, for example, to

John Leyden borne in Holland poore and base,  
*Th. Dekker, Old Fortunatus, Repr. Pearson, Vol. I, p. 94.*

77. K.

Let me see thine eyes: wink now: now open them:  
*Sh. II H 6. II, 1, 105.*

*Let me* to be pronounced *le'm'*; see *ante*.

## 78. K.

Shalt stir up in Suffolk, Norfolk and in Kent,  
*Sh.* III H 6. IV, 8, 12.

Pope has cancelled *up* in this line; we think it more ~~probable~~ that *shalt* is an interpolation.

## 79. K.

You were ever good at sudden commendations,  
*Sh.* H 8. V, 3, 122.

## 80. K.

You were pretty lordings then?  
*Pol.* We were, fair queen,  
*Sh.* W. T. I, 2, 62.

## 81. K.

You were kneel'd to and importuned otherwise  
*Sh.* Tp. II, 1, 128.

## 82. K.

You were best go in.  
*Oth.* Not I: I must be found:  
*Sh.* O. I, 2, 30.

## 83. K.

You were best to tell Antonio what you hear;  
*Sh.* M. of V. II, 8, 33.

## 84. K.

You were best to go to bed and dream again,  
*Sh.* II H 6. V, 1, 196.

In the six lines just given we have coalition of *you* and *were*; apparently this coalition admits of two modes of pronunciation, viz. as *you're*, thus printed in the Folio of 1623 (*Cym.* III, 2, 79), and as *y'were*, thus printed, for instance, on p. 153 of the First Part of *Hudibras*, or in the following way, to figure the same pronunciation:

Make it not strange. I know, yo' were one, could keepe  
*Ben Jonson*, Folio 1616, p. 607.

It is highly probable that the difference is one in

pearance only, since the pronunciation of *you* as *yee* must have been common, so that there need hardly have been any difference between *yee're* and *y'were*.

## 85. K.

She was often cited by them, but appear'd not:

*Sh. H 8. IV, 1, 29.*

Pronounce *She was* as *sh'was*; compare

Women, she went away before sh'was one.

*J. Donne, Funeral Elegy, 1633, p. 254.*

## 86. K.

Are not you a strumpet?

*Des.*

No, as I am a Christian:

*Sh. O. IV, 2, 82.*

Pronounce *Arn't you a strump?* For *arn't*, compare

That many of themselves ar'not onely poore,

*Wither, Juvenilia, Repr. Spens. Soc. p. 341.*

The spelling is not absolutely convincing to such as are unacquainted with the mode of printing of the old editions. Ben Jonson, for instance, spells the monosyllable *yn't* thus: *sha'not*. But in Fleckno's Diarium of 1656 we readily find the more correct spellings *ben't*, *can't*, *don't*, *ryn't* and *shan't*. For the curtailed form *strump* we cite

This strump will confound him.

*Card & Decker, The Sun's Darling, Repr. Pearson, Vol. IV, p. 323.*

## 87. K.

O ye gods, ye gods! must I endure all this?

*Sh. J. C. IV, 3, 41.*

Pronounce and scan: O yé göds, yé göds, múst idúre all thís?

In support of the coalition *I'ndure* we cite

Ill vnto her, to whom my selfe I'engage.

*Heywood, Procus & Puella, Repr. Pearson, Vol. VI, p. 118.*

Or, to show a mode of printing that is perfectly ambiguous,

Assist me but this once, I'mplere,  
And I shall trouble thee no more.

*Butler*, *Hudibras*, 1663, I Part, p. 50.

## 88. K.

Do you love my son?

*Hel.*

Your pardon, noble mistress!

*Sh. A. W. I, 3. 192.*

Pronounce *do you* as *d'you*, as indicated in print in

Do' you thinke, that I dare moue him?

*Dap.*

If you please, sir,

*Ben Jonson*, Folio 1616, p. 613.

or *d'ee*, a form we have repeatedly met with, or *d'yee* (perhaps the same) as in

As how d'yee, or, God saue yee, for a greeting.

*Wither*, *Juvenilia*, Repr. Spens. Soc. p. 224.

## 89. K.

Harry Bolingbroke doth humbly kiss thy hand;

*Sh. R 2. III, 3. 104.*

Pronounce *Bolingbroke* as *Bolbróke*. The word is often found spelt *Bullenbrooke*, and the syncopation is exactly on a level with *Buckham* for *Buckingham*; compare

Though Leatherhead went to Buckham towne,

*Fleckno*, *Diarium*, 1656, p. 43.

## 90. K.

Thou wert better gall the devil. Salisbury:

*Sh. John, IV, 3. 95.*

*Thou wert* = *thou'rt*, as found printed in the *Shakespeare* Folio of 1623, Tp. I, 2, 366.

## 91. K.

Now, my lord, what shall we do, if we perceive

*Sh. R 3, III, 1. 191.*

*My lord* = *m'lord*, which is of frequent occurrence in positions that demand monosyllabic pronunciation. See *ante*.

Synalephe before *l* is by no means rare; see, for instance,

Not t'liue as ill, but dye as well as he.

*J. Taylor*, Folio 1630, Repr. Spens. Soc. p. 33.

Th'lord Dacres, and Lord Wels, both wise and warlike wights.

*Drayton*, Poly-Olbion, Repr. Spens. Soc. p. 380.

## 92. K.

Know ye Don Antonio, your countryman?

*Sh. Gent.* II, 4, 54.

The precise pronunciation may be doubtful, but it is beyond all question that *know ye* may become a monosyllabic coalition. In Ben Jonson analogous coalitions are found spelt thus: *Cry'you, ga'you, gi'you, Ha'you, Pray ye'. Say you* we have found twice in the same page thus:

What sa'y Sir?

*Th. Heywood*, Fair Maid o. the W. Repr. Pearson, Vol. II, p. 266.

*With you* is found printed *wi'you* in Ben Jonson, and elsewhere we have come across

But come we'l trifle w'ye no longer.

*Heywood & Broome*, Witches of Lancashire, Repr.

Pearson, Vol. IV, p. 259.

## 93. S.

To adore the Conqueror, who now beholds

*Milton*. P. L. I, 323.

Pronounce of course *t'adore*.

## 94. S.

You have brought us nipping weather — Februere.

*Ben Jonson*, Tub, I, 1, 2.

Pronounce of course *y'ha* (First Ed.: You'ha').

## 95. S.

The high constable's daughter of Kentish Town here master

*Ben Jonson*, Tub, I, 1, 26.

Pronounce *Th'high constab's daught'(r) of*, etc. We have not found the form *constab* in print, but we have come across such spellings as, for instance, *gent* for *gentle*, *lit* for *little*, *mirac* for *miracle*, *sing* for *single*, *syllab* for *syllable*, etc. For *daught'(r) of* we cite

My sistr' and I, into this world were sent,  
*Gascoigne*, *The Steele Glas*, *Arber's Repr.* p. 51.

96. S.

I shall number as many lovers as Lais did  
*Fletcher*, *Hum. Lieut.* IV, 1, 33.

Pronounce *I shall* as *I'se*, and both times as as 's.

See *ante*.

97. S.

Did I never tell thee of a vow he made?  
*Fletcher*, *Loy. Subj.* I, 1, 30.

Of course *never* = *ne'er*.

98. S.

They are too high a meat that way, they run to jelly  
*Fletcher*, *ibid.* 371. (?)

According to Prof. Schipper this verse is an instance of a line with "dreifachem Auftakt". Nothing less! In our opinion the line is an instance of signal carelessness in citing evidential passages.

In Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher's *Folio* 1647, pp. 37 & 38, the text stands thus:

Pray ye let me request yee, to forget  
 To say your prayers, whilst these are Courtiers;  
 Or if yee needs will thinke of heaven, let it be no higher  
 Then their eyes?

*Bor.* How will ye have 'em bestow'd sir?

*Theo.* Even how your Lordship please,  
 So you doe not bake 'em.

*Bor.* Bake 'em.

*Th.* They are too high a meat that way, they run to gelly.  
 But if you'll have 'em for your own dyet, take my counsel,  
 Stew'em between two feather-beds.

*Bur.* Please you Colonell  
 To let 'em wait upon the Princesse?

*Theo.* Yes sir,

One thing is plain at first sight, viz. that the blank verse has got hopelessly out of hand. And he who wants

cite blank-verse lines in evidence, can be allowed to do only on condition that the blank verse before and after the line cited be above suspicion, for every expert knows that line-shifting is one of the commonest things in the old editions.

The original blank verse is quite easy to restore in the use before us, and from it the "dreifacher Auftakt" has vanished:

Pray ye let me request ye to forget  
To say your pray'rs, whilst these are courtiërs;  
Or if ye needs will think of hea'n, le' 't be  
No higher than their eyes.

*Bor.* How will you have 'em  
'Stow'd, sir?

*Theo.* E'n how your lordship please, so you  
Don't bake 'em.

*Bor.* Bake 'em?

*Theo.* Th'are too high a meat,  
That way they run to jelly. But if you'll  
Have 'em for your own diet, take my counsel,  
Stew 'em between two fea'r-beds.

*Bor.* Please you, colonel,  
To let 'em wait upon the Princess?

*Theo.* Yes, sir.

If furthermore another thing is clear as daylight it is that *bestow'd*, the printer's word, should be pronounced *stow'd*. Unless this is done, the whole passage is sheer nonsense. For it is only the verb *to stow* that can give rise to the word-play with *to bake* and *to stew* in what follows. Compare *show* and *shew*, *strow* and *strew*, *shrow* and *shrew*, &c.). *Bestow'd* is the wrong form preferred by the printer, while the author must have used the word without the *be-* prefix.

Here we accordingly find the rule as to a line of blank verse being made up of ten syllables, backed by the logical

requirements of the text, no matter whether this text be in metre or in prose. Of course the cases, in which, as in the passage just treated, the prosaic requirements of ordinary logic at once show the extra syllable to have arisen from a typical printer's corruption, must always be comparatively few in number. But such cases exist; we have elsewhere cited some from the old Shakespeare texts and other old prints, and would here remind the reader of our Spenser example on pp. 77 ff.; and their existence is one of the arguments which taken together put it beyond reasonable doubt that the MSS. were tampered with in the printing-offices.

If now in conclusion we try to estimate the evidentiary force of this large number of 98 instances so far as the existence of the extra syllable is concerned, we find

that 12 lines must be ruled out of court, because they do not in that form occur in the authoritative texts, such as lines 1, 3, 10, 12 and 49, to which must be added the prose lines 6, 73, 74 and 75; or because the line is too short, as is the case with l. 16; or because the line is written in "tumbling verse", as is the case with l. 5; or because the line actually contains 10 syllables, but owing to the unusual incidence of the accents, is a stumbling-block to the prosodist, as we have seen to be the case with l. 42. Perhaps l. 45 should also be included in this number, but we prefer to class it with the following group;

that in 71 cases the extra syllable can be accounted for on the basis of the old pronunciation. In order to be quite accurate, we make the reservation here, that there is an off-chance that four or five of these lines must fall under the third group. We furthermore would have it clearly understood, that the *possibility* of the pronunciation postulated

by us, has in nearly every case been proved by the evidence we have brought forward, especially if readers will kindly supplement our necessarily brief notes by what we have elsewhere set forth at greater length. What might be called the least certain of our postulated pronunciations, are only three cases of the coalescence of *I was*, and two cases of the coalescence of *I were*<sup>1)</sup>; as regards those last mentioned, it is, besides, quite possible that they should be classed with the third group;

that in the 15 remaining lines the extra syllable admits of explanation as owing its existence to textual corruption. We have absolutely proved this to be the case with ll. 37 and 46. We may also consider this as proved with regard to lines 13, 64, and 98, where a mere re-arrangement of the lines, setting right common cases of line-shifting, restores the regularity of the blank verse without any further textual change. In the nine lines 7, 28, 48, 61, 62, 63, 65, 66, and 78, we postulate illegitimate interpolation of one small word, of which it is at all events proved that it is totally superfluous. Two of these nine cases have been set right already in the second Folio of 1632. It is moreover quite sure that the interpolation (and, for the matter of that, also the omission) of small words of this kind, which are superfluous and absolutely immaterial to the sense to be conveyed, are among the very commonest corruptions to be met with in old printed texts. Strong proof of this is furnished by the fact that in two given authoritative texts, *e. g.* the Quarto and the Folio text of Richard III, it is precisely the occurrence or non-occurrence of these small words that constitutes one of the most common categories of mutual divergencies.

---

<sup>1)</sup> *thou'rt* and *you're* for *thou wert* and *you were* are found in print.

Another proof of this is the well-attested circumstance that in old reprints words of this class are almost regularly interpolated, though of course their omission is still far more frequent. The fifteenth and last case of this third group is l. 24, in which we assume *to* to have been replaced by its synonym *unto*. Now this very substitution of one synonymous word for another we find to be of almost regular occurrence in the old reprints, and it is again one of the very commonest categories of divergencies between two authoritative texts, such as, for example, the Quarto and Folio texts of Richard III.

Since from the very nature of the case corruptions of the text do not as a rule admit of strict and direct proof, all that can reasonably be expected concerning such corruptions, is a demonstration of their greater or lesser probability, and such demonstration we think we have succeeded in giving. But strictly speaking, we can do with less than probability in the case of these textual corruptions: we may rest content with having shown their possibility. For if only it is possible to eliminate all extra syllables by a reference to the old pronunciation, and by assuming possible corruptions of the text, it is our consistent duty to proceed to such elimination, because this is the only method that does not place us in flat contradiction to the highest authorities on this point, viz. the writers whose statements we have cited in the first part of this chapter. And if we should for a moment suppose that these highest authorities were all of them mistaken, in that case it is simply inconceivable that we cannot point to numerous verse-lines, in the case of which neither the rules of a bygone mode of pronunciation nor the assumption of textual corruption offer the ghost of a chance of getting away from the extra syllable.

and at the same time it would in that case be utterly impossible to understand why the nineteenth century authorities are so completely at variance on the question what exactly must be looked upon as an extra syllable. How hopelessly they differ on the subject is seen at once from the fact that only 13 lines out of the 98 we have discussed, can boast of the honour of being adduced by more than one of our nineteenth century authorities. One line only, No. 2, is cited by four of them; one other line only, No. 9, by three; and more than eleven lines in all are brought forward by two authorities; while at the same time we find that in general these gentlemen are fully *au courant* of what their respective predecessors have written on the subject, and are not in the least averse to standing indebted to each other for important pieces of evidence, *in casu* lines selected from others in blank verse. So far as they work independently of each other (which can least be said of Prof. Schipper), however, they very often do not take over each other's identifiary instances, *for the simple reason that they do not believe in them*. Take, for example, Ellis's first instance, No. 26; both Abbott and König here postulate the enunciation *bar'n*. Take Ellis's second example, our No. 27; here Guest, and Abbott, and König, unite in assuming the enunciation *ha'ng*. The first five examples given by Mayor are lines which also Guest adduces, but which he explains exactly the other way. And he who should take the trouble of comprehensively tabulating all the discrepancies between the respective views of the six authorities selected by us, would arrive at the somewhat amusing and at the same time highly instructive result that the number of cases in which they concur in rejecting each other's lines cited as evidence of the existence of the extra syllable, far exceeds the

number of those instances in which they agree in the opinion that such and such an extra syllable is a *bona fide* and undoubted one.

For some years past we have been prospecting on the territory of the alleged extra syllable in every possible direction.

Whenever we had the pleasure of being introduced to such an extra syllable, or fancied we had discovered one on our own account, steps towards more intimate acquaintance invariably led to its turning out to be the mere ghost of one. But there is one reservation which we deem it our duty to make. We do not wish to deny the bare possibility for a genuine extra syllable to figure legitimately before or after a strongly-marked pause in the middle of the line. If such a genuine extra syllable exists at all, it can only occur in a few of the older poets. Its existence has not hitherto been proved, although all authorities on prosody take such existence for granted. Nor is it surprising that they should do so, for they all of them assume the existence of extra syllables everywhere else in the line, so that their assumption of it in this position proves nothing. On theoretical grounds its existence in the blank-verse line could be accounted for unforcedly enough. But actual proof of its existence requires the bringing forward of a considerable number of lines by the same poet, in all of which this extra syllable is found under conditions in which it is impossible either to explain it away on the basis of the old pronunciation, or to postulate textual corruption with any reasonable degree of probability. It is in this last condition that the difficulty lies. No doubt, we find, for instance, precisely in Shakespeare a few blank-verse lines that would seem to meet the two requirements we have mentioned, but their number

is so small, and the authoritative Shakespeare texts have been handed down to us in a state of such hopeless corruption, that so long as it is found impossible to adduce in evidence the required pretty large number of lines (say fifty instances from Shakespeare out of his thousands upon thousands of blank-verse lines), we hold that no one has a right to assume the existence of those extra syllables, in that contradiction to the express statements of those contemporaries who have written about Elizabethan prosody. or it should be kept in mind that in cases in which we are brought face to face with the concurrent testimony of contemporary, i. e. the highest, authorities, it is after all possible that such concurrent testimony may not be absolutely correct; but before we admit its incorrectness, or, let us say, an exception to the general rule, the burden of strict proof lies with us. Proof of the non-existence of the extra syllable need not and cannot be given, since general negatives do not admit of demonstration. The burden of proof in this case lies with our opponents. We have clearly shown in the present paper that up to now they have brought forward inefficient and altogether unsatisfactory arguments only, and have utterly failed to adduce convincing proof of the truth of their allegations.

III.  
AN INQUIRY INTO  
THE USE OF SYNIZESIS

IN SHAKESPEAREAN AND MILTONIC VERSE.

By Synizesis we understand a peculiar shortening of the pronunciation of certain words causing two syllables to coalesce into one.

If, for instance, we look up the word *folio* in Webster's Dictionary, or the word *guano* in the Historical English Dictionary edited by Murray and Bradley, — not conversely, for authorities frequently differ on questions of orthoepy — we find that these words may be pronounced in three syllables as *fo-li-o* and *gu-a-no*, or in two syllables as *fol-yo* and *gwa-no*. The second mode of pronunciation is technically known as synizesis, and differs from all other shortening such as aphaeresis, syncope, apocope, synalephe, and coalition, by the retention of the same number of letter-sounds heard in the uncontracted form, the only difference being that the vowel-sound in the syllable with weakest stress changes its nature by becoming consonantal, and being uttered as forming part of the following syllable.

Strictly speaking, we know nothing about the occurrence of synizesis in the pronunciation of Shakespeare's time.

We might, indeed, be strongly inclined to take for granted the synizetic pronunciation of the small group of words of which, for instance, *assuage* and *persuade* are representatives of very frequent occurrence. For in this case the modern sound would seem to be fully proved for Elizabethan pronunciation also, by the old spellings *assuage*, *persuade*, etc., which, always in more or less frequent alternation with the modern orthography, can be traced up to the manuscripts of Chaucer's and Gower's works.

But here too, on nearer view, doubts begin to arise. p. 25 of that curious booklet of his, *The New Art of Writing*, from which we have repeatedly quoted, Dr. Jones tells us that at the close of the seventeenth century in the words *dissuade*, *persuade*, etc. the sounding of the *w* was no more than optional: it might with equal correctness be dropped in pronunciation. If Dr. Jones's evidence is trustworthy, and there is no reason to doubt the truth of the statement, since various analogies go to prove that formerly the *w* was very often dropped in pronunciation in cases where it is invariably sounded in our day, there would seem to be good grounds for assuming that *dissade* and *persade* represent the old pronunciation of Chaucer's, and perhaps of Shakespeare's time, whereas *dissuade* and *persuade* figure a legitimate alternative mode of pronunciation which arose at the end of the sixteenth century at the latest, and ultimately drove out the former pronunciation altogether.

We shall beg leave to illustrate by one example the ignorance evinced by modern philologists regarding

the old pronunciation of the class of words that forms the subject of the present chapter.

What is the correct pronunciation of the word *ruffian* in the following line?

Who take the ruffian billows by the top,  
*Shakespeare*, II H 4. III, 1, 22.

On p. 41 of his book *Der Vers in Shaksperes Dramen*, Goswin König stands up for the *ruf-yan* pronunciation. Although he gives no reasons for his supposition, we may take for granted that the admissible synizetic pronunciation of our time, concurring with the metrical requirements which in this line prescribe dissyllabic pronunciation of the word *ruffian*, has led him to this conclusion. At the same time we must here observe that on p. 42 König also claims for the words *annual*, *intellectual*, *Mantua*, etc., a synizetic pronunciation of which our times know nothing whatever.

Ellis on the other hand, who had made an elaborate study of the old writers on phonetics, but had found no traces of a synizetic pronunciation of words of the *ruffian* class in the predecessors and contemporaries of Shakespeare, lays down on p. 988 of his *Early English Pronunciation* that in the line we have quoted, *ruffian* must be sounded as a trisyllable: *ruf-fi-an*.

Both these authorities, König as well as Ellis — the former being more of a prosodic, the latter more of a phonetic authority — are mistaken. The pronunciation required in this case is *ruffen*, exactly the same as the modern sound of the verb *roughen*.

König's mistake is that he gives a mere guess, because he lacks the data which only a quite independent and extensive study of the subject could have supplied him with.

Ellis misses the point, because his study of the old writers on phonetics had been altogether onesided. The

d-world booklets they have left us, which to the philologically trained eye of our day appear childishly fragmentary and sadly deficient in sense of proportion, treat only of what our authors looked upon as main points. We may to a certain extent learn from them how letters and letter-groups were sounded at the time, but far more meagre is the information they furnish on those cases in which letters were *not* pronounced. And, as a rule, they altogether fail — nor need we greatly wonder at the circumstance — to tell us what different pronunciations of a given word were equally admissible, and where we light on the greatest difficulty and at the same time the most vulnerable point of all ancient and modern phonetics.

If Ellis had studied the writers on prosody with the same industry which he has bestowed on those on phonetics, he would have learnt that trisyllabic pronunciation of the word *ruffian* in the line we have cited is a sheer impossibility. Extra syllables or "trisyllabic measures", as Ellis calls them, are non-existent in the English metre of Shakespeare's and Milton's times, a point for which we must refer the reader to the preceding chapter.

And if Ellis had bestowed only a moderate degree of attention on the first editions of the old poets — his great work shows that on this point he has gone no further than an occasional reference to the first Folio of Shakespeare — and had taken careful note of the different modes of spelling here found exemplified, he certainly could not but have observed numerous systematic deviations from the current orthography of the time, which can only be accounted for by the supposition that they originate in phonetic considerations. He would in that case have found the form *ruffin* in II H 4. v, 5, 125 (Q), in II H 6. I, 1, 188 (Q), or, for instance, in

When desprate Ruffins fraught with faults finde readily a Meuse,<sup>1)</sup>

William Warner. Albions England 1612. p. 404.

Hees rather a wilde ruffin than a Maior.

Th. Dekker. The Shoemakers Holiday. V, 3. 4 (Reprint Warnke).

Ellis certainly is right so far as trisyllabic pronunciation was admissible in the word *ruffian* in Shakespeare's time. But it was assuredly not the usual pronunciation, since in Shakespeare's works *ruffian* occurs 17 times in metre, and in every case as a dissyllable.

The same mistake into which we have shown Ellis to have fallen with regard to the word *ruffian*, is made by him again and again, so that we are at last fain to ask, whether in none of the old authorities his eye has lighted on statements that might have set him right. The answer must be, that Ellis has come across hundreds of facts that could not be made to tally with his hypothetical statement, and that of these facts he mentions several in his book; but that at the same time he totally neglects to make use of, or even to discuss them, nay, that he *repeatedly* weakens the significance of the said facts by putting them in a decidedly wrong light.

From a copious store of pertinent examples we select a couple of noteworthy instances.

On p. 44 of his little book Dr. Jones asks, "When is the sound of *e* written *ie*?" and his answer is, "When it may be sounded *ie*, as in *Audience*, *Brasier*", etc. The most obvious inference to be drawn from such a question and such an answer is, that *audence* figures the usual pronunciation, but that speakers *were* also *free* to pronounce the word in three syllables, *au-di-ence*, in accordance with the modern practice. This inference now becomes an actual

---

<sup>1)</sup> Usually spelt *muse*, 'a hole to creep out at', a means of escape.

certainly to those who have attentively studied Jones's book; and to clinch the argument, the prevalence of the dissyllabic pronunciation of the word *audience* at the close of the seventeenth century is proved by the fact that with the poets of the time the word seems to count as two syllables only; we at least do not remember to have come across a single example of its occurring as a trisyllable. On going back to the middle of the seventeenth century we find that Milton uses *audience* 8 times in metre, also each time as a dissyllable. Even in Shakespeare dissyllabic pronunciation of the word is the rule, for there we find it 22 times as a dissyllable, and 3 times only as a word of three syllables. In Gower on the contrary it is found as a trisyllable only.

In line 20 of Dryden's *Character of a Good Parson*, first published in 1699,

He drew his audience upward to the sky.

Ellis on p. 1037 looks upon the word *audience* as a trisyllable. He utterly disregards here Dr. Jones's statement published in 1701. Of this statement he only says on p. 1002, in his "Pronouncing Vocabulary of the XVII cent.," that according to Jones the pronunciation of *audience* was "sometimes" dissyllabic "AA dens." Now, if one thing must be clear to the reader, it is this, that Jones does *not* characterise the dissyllabic pronunciation of *audience* as an exception of occasional occurrence; if from Ellis's point of view we were to attempt to haggle with Jones, we assuredly could never get beyond a state of things in which the dis- and the trisyllabic pronunciation of the word could be said to be of equal frequency.

And what shall we say, for instance, to Ellis's statement that according to Jones the pronunciation of the ending *-uous* in *conspicuous* is dissyllabic, the simple truth being that on pp. 88 and 117 of his book Jones says that the

ending in question is usually monosyllabic, but may be pronounced as two syllables?

To take another example: on p. 1012 Ellis tells his readers that according to Jones the pronunciation of *opinion* is "opinən, pinən by the vulgar". Both these statements are incorrect. On p. 45 Jones mentions the first pronunciation given by Ellis, as well as a pronunciation in four syllables owing to the dissyllabic sound of the *-ion* ending. These two pronunciations are both of them admissible according to Jones. On p. 89 Jones says that it is vulgar to use the aphetised form *pinion* for *opinion*, but of the synizetic pronunciation (*opinyon* with *y* consonant), as Ellis gives it, there is absolutely nothing to be found in Jones's book.

As an instance of a very different nature we add that Ellis utterly forgets to mention the fact that in *disuade* and *persuade* the *w* might be dropped at the speaker's option (see *ante*, p. 115).

So that, leaving alone Ellis's inferences, we have a right to say that even his statements of facts must be received with the utmost caution.

To be sure, if we wish to come to any substantial results in this field, we shall have to enter upon an entirely new and independent study of the facts of the case.

The possibility of synizesis in a given case is conditioned by the coincidence of three mutually independent circumstances:

1° the vowels of the syllables eventually to be run together must not be separated by a consonant;

2° the syllable containing the first vowel-sound must have less stress than the syllable containing the second;

3<sup>o</sup> the vowel in the syllable to become eventually absorbed in the following syllable, must be either an *i*-sound or a *u*-sound, since only these two sounds allow of consonantisation into *y* [*si* < *sh*] or *w* respectively; no other vowels or diphthongs being capable of figuring as consonants.

As regards the second condition it should be kept in mind that it is often exceedingly difficult to decide which is the weaker stressed of two unaccented syllables. In the case of the pronunciation of the seventeenth or the sixteenth century this difficulty frequently becomes insuperable. When therefore, we institute an historical inquiry into the possibility of synizesis, we shall do well by also extending this inquiry to all words in which two unaccented vowels are not separated by a consonant.

As a matter of course such words as *diary*, *alliance*, etc., in which the primary accent is on the first of the two consecutive vowels, remain undiscussed, because they have nothing to do with the present investigation.

On the strength of the third condition we have mentioned, we might be inclined to restrict our inquiry to those words in which the first of the two vowel-sounds is figured by an *i* or a *u*. In the unstressed positions, however, which are here treated of, these letters *i* and *u* by no means represent distinct *i*- and *u*-sounds, but invariably, or at least very frequently, merely the indefinite vowel-sound to which each of the different vowels may pale down. Accordingly, in these positions *i* and *u* are pretty much on a level with all the other vowels. So that there is nothing for it but to review all the other vowels as well, in doing which we shall light on certain phonetic analogies that may turn out to be of special value.

We shall successively review all the words that must

come into consideration on the principles just stated, and so far as possible determine their pronunciation from the data we have collected; of course only so far as such pronunciation bears on our present subject, and equally of course we can treat such words only as are used in metre by Shakespeare and Milton, for the simple reason that only in the case of these words can we answer the question whether or not they occur in a shortened form, this question being always the first that requires an answer.

As regards Milton's verse our statements are meant to be exhaustive. We have personally examined all Milton's lines without exception, and constantly checked, and in a very few cases corrected, the results arrived at, by consulting Bradshaw's Concordance<sup>1</sup>). With this concordance as a whole we have little fault to find: we have failed to find in it references to the words *Campanian* P. R. IV, 93, and *Emilian* P. R. IV, 69, and have found misprints in very rare instances only, such as in the case of *pre-eminent*, where the reference should be to P.L. 4, and not to P.L. 5. The plan of the work excludes Milton's Psalms and the Translations in the Prose works.

Exhaustiveness is attainable in the case of Milton's verse, because in the first editions of his works — we have used Beeching's well-known reprint — his text has been handed down to us in so unexceptionable a condition. Absolutely faultless, of course, that text is not. It was impossible for the blind Milton to do his proof-reading with absolute correctness. Thus we find, for instance, a couple of lineshiftings, viz. in P.L. X, 989 & 990

---

<sup>1</sup>) A Concordance to the poetical works of John Milton by John Bradshaw, M. A., LL. D. London, Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1894.

Childless thou art, Childless remaine:

So Death shall be deceav'd his glut, and with us two

where of course the words *So Death* ought to form part of the preceding line; and in ll. 496 & 497 of *Samson Agonistes*:

The mark of fool set on his front?

But I Gods counsel have not kept, his holy secret

where the first two words of l. 497 ought to form part of the preceding verse. In this case, however, the line-shifting is slightly less sure, because the length of the lines in *Samson Agonistes* is not uniform. We find the word *then* to have dropped out in P. L. X, 827, but the mistake has been rectified in the second edition, brought out in 1674.

In the same way the word *now* has in the second edition been inserted between *delighted* and *Evening* in P.L. V, 627.

Though, therefore, a few printer's errors can be pointed out with perfect certainty, we feel bound emphatically to add that their number is very small, and that they cannot affect the results of our present investigation.

What, indeed, signify such trifling inaccuracies in comparison with the typographical Augean stables which are known as the *editiones principes* of Shakespeare's works!

In the case of Shakespeare there cannot be the least question of comprising in our statements all the words that occur in metre, because the metre is so often hopelessly corrupt, in consequence of which it is impossible to determine the number of syllables of a given word with anything like tolerable certitude.

Our statements with respect to Shakespeare, therefore, must unavoidably fall short of the exhaustiveness which in the case of Milton was attainable enough. Besides, in a few cases they are based on our subjective notions, as to which no general discussion is possible, while the special discussion of all the individual cases would demand more

space than would be made good by the profit that might accrue to the student.

In drawing up our statements touching Shakespeare's use of words in metre, we have examined all the passages bearing on them in Al. Schmidt's lexicon <sup>1)</sup>, and supplemented them by the references in Mrs. Cowden Clarke's Concordance. For the words in the *Poems* we have in the same way used Bartlett's Concordance <sup>2)</sup>. These Concordances are exactly logarithmic tables for immaculate correctness, and their completeness is far from being absolute. Bartlett has missed out the word *patience* in Shrew III, 2, 21 (Mrs. Cowden Clarke has the same omission); Tr. & Cr. V, 2, 1; T. A. I, 1, 203; and O. I, 1, 104. We have no right to find great fault with this, since Bartlett says in his preface — and Mrs. Cowden Clarke has acted on the same principle — that he has not always registered words used "interjectionally". But this can be no reason for his omission of references to the word *patient* in Tr. & Cr. V, 2, 47 and A. & Cl. IV, 12, 38; and why has Mrs. Cowden Clarke failed to register the occurrence of the word *virtuous* in Ado II, 3, 240? Etc., etc.

We arrange the words on the basis of their modern spelling. We do not separately notice words with the same pronunciation that may be nouns as well as verbs, etc. Hyphenated words and compounds will be found under their primitives. We use the abbreviation M. for Milton and Sh. for Shakespeare. By adding the word /

<sup>1)</sup> Shakespeare - Lexicon, etc. by Dr. Alexander Schmidt. 1871. London, Williams & Norgate.

<sup>2)</sup> The Complete Concordance to Shakespeare: etc. by Mrs. Cowden Clarke. 1881. London, Bickers & Son.

<sup>3)</sup> A New and Complete Concordance etc. By John Bartlett, A. 1894. London, Macmillan & Co.

we give to understand that the two vowel-sounds belonging to different syllables are both of them pronounced; the word *short* denotes that the two syllables to which the two vowel-sounds respectively belong, are run together into one syllable. "M. *short*: Canaan 7*t*." means that the word Canaan is seven times used by Milton in metre with the ending *-naan* pronounced as one syllable. To economise space, we give references only if Milton or Shakespeare use a given word both *full* and *short*. We also give the references to all exceptions of especial interest.

## I. 1. aa.

M. *full*: Sennaar *once*.

*short*: Aaron 3*t*.; Balaam *once*; Canaan 7*t*.;  
Canaanite *twice*; Isaac *once*.

Sh. *short*: Aaron 26*t*.

The word *Aaron*, as to which Jones already very justly observes that its spelling is apt to induce a wrong pronunciation, would seem to be exclusively dissyllabic in English, at least so far back as Chaucer and Gower.

*Isaac* occurs twice in Gower, in both cases as a trisyllable. Its syncopation — any other mode of shortening is of course out of the question — is marked by the mode of printing in

The Fields, for prayer, Isa'ck chose:

G. *Wither*, Hallelviah I, H. XXXI, 1. (Repr. Spens. Soc.)

Of greater interest is the following:

This holy starre, whose contr'aspect most clear

Th. *Hudson*, Sylvester's Folio of 1621, p. 723.

## I. 2. ae.

M. *full*: Ismael *once*: Israel 8*t*., *e. g.* P.R. III, 410;

Laertes *once*; Michael 6*t*., *e. g.* P.L. VI, 202;

Raphael 4*t*., *e. g.* P.L. V, 561.

*short*: Israel 36 *t.*, *e. g.* P.R. III, 408; Israelite *twice* ;  
Michael 19 *t.*, *e. g.* P.L. VI, 250; Raphael 4 *t.*, *e. g.* P.L. V, 221.

Sh. *full*: Laertes 27 *t.*

*short*: Michael 18 *t.*

Gower has Raphael *once*, and I(s)rael 10 *t.* always *full* ; but as early as Chaucer we find "*Michelmesse*". There can be no doubt of the syncopation in this case; in print we find it marked, for instance in

Calamity to match old Isr'els Tribes:

*J. Taylor*, F. 1630. p. 23. (Repr. Spens. Soc.)

I. 3. ai.

M. *full*: Ephraim *twice*, *e. g.* S.A. 988.

*short*: Alcairo *once*; Asmodai *twice*; Ephraim *once*  
in Ps. LXXX, 9; Sinai 3 *t.*

If we except the word *Ephraim*, *ai* in the words here mentioned is and has been always pronounced as one syllable in English. Already in Chaucer we find *Sinay* rhyming with *day*, so that *ai* was considered as a diphthong, formerly pronounced as the modern sound of the interjection *aye*.

In our time *Sinai* may be pronounced both with the old and with the modern diphthongal sound in the word *day*. Matters were still precisely the same in 1701, as regards the *short* pronunciation of *Ephraim*. On pp. 21 & 22 Jones registers *Ephraim* among the words whose *ai* might have the modern sound of the *a* in *hate*, or the old sound which was identical with the modern sound of the interjection *aye*.

I. 4. ao.

M. *full*: Eshtaol *once*; extraor(di)nary *once*.

*short*: Pharaoh 3 *t.*

Sh. *full*: extraordinary *twice*, *e. g.* I H 4. III, 2, 78;  
Lycaonia *once*.

*short*: extraor(di)nary *once* in W.T. I, 2, 227.

In p. 79 of his book Jones mentions the *o*-sound as the only current one of the letters *ao* in the words *Bilbao*, *ordinary*, and *Pharaoh*. (On the preceding page he gives the pronunciation *ornance* and *ornary* for *ordinance* and *ordinary*.) Chaucer has *Pharaoh* both "full" and "short", but it is still the practice of our time.

## II. 1. ea.

*d. full*: beatific *once*; Eleale *once*; ethereal *once* in P.L. V, 499; Gibeah *once*; ocean *once* in Christs Nat. 66; Paneas *once*; Pelleas *once*; preamble *once*; recreant *once*. Also without exception *create* and all its derivatives, so far as the present investigation is concerned with them; the same state of things as regards *create*, etc. obtains in Sh.

*. short*: Ægean *twice*; æreal 5 *t.*; Boreas *once*; Cerberian *once*; Chalybean *once*; corporeal 4 *t.*; delineate *once*; empyreal 11 *t.*; ethereal 24 *t.*, *e. g.* P.L. I, 45; Herculean *once*; incorporeal 3 *t.*; laureate *twice*; Leucothea *twice*; lineament 3 *t.*; ocean 20 *t.*, *e. g.* P.L. II, 183; Oread *once*; pageantry *once*; roseate *once*; subterranean *once*; Tartarean *once*; Thyestean *once*; venereal *once*.

*sh. full*: Leander *twice*; lineal *once* in I H 6. III, 1, 166; miscreant *twice* in I H 6. V, 3, 44 and R 2. I, 1, 39; Neapolitan *twice*; ocean 7 *t.* in Gent. II, 7, 32; M. of V. I, 1, 8; John II, 1, 340; *ibid.* IV, 3, 132; II H 4. III, 1, 50; H 5. III, 1, 14; and T. A. IV, 2, 101; Orleans 12 *t.*, *e. g.* I H 6. I, 1, 111; pageant *once* in

II H 6. I, 2, 67; procreant *once* in O. IV, 2, 28; recreant 5 *t.*, *e. g.* Cor. V, 3, 114; sergeant *once* in Mac. I, 2, 3.

Sh. *short*: Ardea *twice*; Eleanor 6 *t.*; Epicúrean *once*; Herculean *once*; lineal 7 *t.*, *e. g.* in John V, 7, 102; lineally *once*; lineament 6 *t.*; miscreant 3 *t.*, *e. g.* I H 6. III, 4, 44; Nemean *twice*; ocean 26 *t.*, *e. g.* Venus 494; Orleans 12 *t.*, *e. g.* I H 6. I, 1, 157; pageant 12 *t.*, *e. g.* Tp. IV, 1, 155; pageantry *once*; procreant *once* in Mac. I, 6, 8; Promethean 3 *t.*; recreant 9 *t.*, *e. g.* Lucr. 710; sergeant 3 *t.*, *e. g.* Ham. V, 2, 347; unlineal *once*; venereal *once*.

As late as the beginning of the eighteenth century Jones mentions the additional medial syllable in the words *ocean*, *pageant*, and *sergeant*. As optionally "full" he gives on p. 24 the words *changeable*, *chargeable*, *manageable*, *peaceable*, *serviceable*, etc., together with *Ocean*, *pageant*, *Prigean*, *Serjeant*, *Vengeance*.

The word last mentioned is found as a trisyllable in Ben Jonson, but we have not up to now met with the words in *-able* with "full" pronunciation. In Chaucer *sergeant* and *vengeance* are "short", so that in the case of all these words, with the single exception of *ocean*, we are bound to assume that we have to do with an intrusive syllable, which, however, was dropped again in the eighteenth century. But the intrusive medial syllable has not disappeared from the word *lineage*, which anciently, and even as late as the sixteenth century, was written without the medial *e*, and sounded without the intrusive syllable. If we find that in course of time speakers begin to pronounce a letter which owes its existence in the spoken word to the spelling, there

is always a very strong presumption that in many cases this same letter was either not pronounced at all, or was only sounded optionally. If at the same time we remember that, with the exception of *ocean*, none of the words above given with "short" pronunciation is in modern parlance shortened by synizesis, this theoretical reasoning must lead us to the conclusion that these words can have lost a syllable, only by syncopation of the medial *e*. And this theoretical conclusion is confirmed by certain observations which we shall now lay before the reader.

Milton uses *corporeal* and *corporeal* in exactly the same sense; see, for instance, P.L. V, 496 and P.L. IV, 585, so that we are inclined to think this difference in spelling equally devoid of significance for pronunciation, with, for instance, the differences seen in *shepheards* and *shepherds*, *heavenly* and *heavnlly* (both of them dissyllabic), and other cases in point that may readily be collected from Milton's rough manuscript book, preserved at Cambridge, and recently brought out in photographic facsimile. This conclusion would, however, probably be both correct and incorrect. To our thinking this *e* has something to do with pronunciation after all, its function being a very peculiar one in this case. The *e* in *corporeal*, we take to be meant for a monitor to warn the reader that the syllabic stress is on the *q* immediately preceding.

*Córporeal* is found 6 times in Milton; in five cases out of the six it is a dissyllable *córp'ral*; in P.L. V, 573 only, we have *corpóral*, and there are good grounds for surmising that it was the printer who missed out the superfluous or quasi-superfluous *e*. *Corpóreal* occurs four times; in P.L. V, 413 alone, the printer seems to have set it up instead of *córporeal*, and he had his reason for it, since the word *incorpóreal* is found in the same line.

We need hardly call attention to the forms *Elenor* and *Elinor*, but would just observe that the word was often syncopated to *Elnor* (six times in Shakespeare), and in this spelling is frequently found in print. In analogy to this we must read *linments* in R 2. III, 1, 9. Since, however, these and the like syncopations are outside the range of our present subject, we need not further refer to them.

We have found *miscreant* syncopated in print in

If to his Faith a Recreant had Miscrent bin his state.

W. Warner, Albions England, 1597, p. 288.

It would be a mistake to conclude from this spelling that in this case we have to do with syncopation of *a*. Spellings like *Miscrent* are very often attempts at phonetic figuration of the spoken sounds. The strictly logical spelling would be *miscr'ant* in this case. The spellings *ruffin* and *Isa'ck* which we have before exemplified, ought to be *ruff'an* and *Is'ack*, for in these words the third syllable has secondary stress; it admits of being utilised as rhyme-syllable by poets, and it is only the weakest stressed syllable that can be dropped in pronunciation.

The following rhyme furnishes striking proof of the syncopation of *e* in the *-ean* ending:

It would demonstrate, that the Man in  
The Moon's a Sea Mediterranean.

Hudibras. Part II, 1664, p. 150.

The great point about Samuel Butler's rhymes is that, however unexpected and novel, they are always quite perfect. We beg leave to lay some stress on the quality last mentioned, because there seems to be an impression in England just now that the funniness of Butler's rhymes is rooted in their slovenliness.

As regards the syncopation of *e* in *Ardea* and *Leucothea*, we must add that it is by no means proved, since apo-

copation of the final *a* is at least quite as possible. Words that have the primary stress on the antepenultimate, fall under the general rule that their last syllable is stronger stressed than the penultimate, and that, consequently, the penultimate is the first to drop out. Of this we have an interesting instance in the American vulgarism *granther* as a syncopation of *grandfather*.<sup>1)</sup> According to another general rule, however, every unstressed final syllable is liable to being dropped in pronunciation. We have seen that the first of the two rules just mentioned accounts for the pronunciation of *Pharao* as *Pharo*; we shall by and by see that the second rule applies to the word *India*; which of the two rules is applied in the shortened pronunciation of *Ardea* and *Leucothea*, we cannot, therefore, decide on theoretical grounds, and we have found nothing to assist us in solving the problem either way. But there is some chance that a third possibility, that of *-ea* in these two words being sounded as in modern *sea*, would hit the mark, because we know this sound to have been in vogue in the case of the word *Guinea*, about which we learn from Jones that its pronunciation at the end of the seventeenth century was the same as the one now in use both for the proper name and the name of the gold coin.

So far as the subject of this section is concerned, the most interesting word in the list above given is the word *ocean*. Jones registers three ways of pronouncing it, viz. the old

---

1) Agin the chimbley crook-necks hung,  
 An' in amongst 'em rusted  
 The ole queen's-arm thet gran'ther Young  
 Fetched back f'om Concord busted.

Lowell, Biglow Papers, The Courtin', 5.

My gran'ther's rule was safer 'n 't is to crow:  
 Don't never prophesy — unless ye know.

*Id.* *ibid.* Second Series, No. 2.

trisyllabic pronunciation, and two dissyllabic ones, one by syncopation and the other by synizesis. The first and the second of these pronunciations must be inferred from the following question and answer on p. 100 of Dr. Jones's book:

"When is the sound of *sa* written *cea*? — When it may be sounded *cea*, as *Ocean*, etc."

That in mentioning "the sound of *sa*" the author cannot have meant the sound of *sha*, is evident

1° from the fact that the question and answer immediately following run thus:

"When is the sound of *sa* written *cea*? — When *able* or any *a* is added to such as end in *ce*, as *serviceable*, etc."

It would be a mistake to conclude from this that Jones puts the same question twice over; the first "sound of *sa*" of course represents another vowel-sound (short *a*) than the second (long *a*); Jones does not make use of phonetic transcriptions;

2° the sound of *sha* cannot have been meant, nor can there be question of a misprint, because the alphabetic order is all right, and "the sound of *sha*" comes a little lower down, where we are informed that *ocean* is sounded *oshan*. That different modes of pronouncing a given word are mentioned in different places of the book, is a necessary consequence of the peculiar arrangement of Jones's *New Art of Spelling*, and is of frequent occurrence in it.

We see, then, that Jones tells us that as late as the beginning of the eighteenth century *ocean* might be pronounced *osan* by syncopation. This must have been the old shortening which came in time to be superseded by the synizetic pronunciation *oshan*; it is highly probable that both these shortenings were in use in Shakespeare's time, as well

as in Milton's. We shall return to this point at the end of the present chapter.

## II. 2. ee.

M. *full*: Beelzebub 4*t*.; preeminence *twice*; preeminent *twice*; reedify *once*; reembattle *once*; reenter *once*; [Caprea*e* *once*; Neera*a* *once*].

Sh. *full*: preeminence *twice*; reedify *once* in T. A. I, 1, 351.

Sh. *short*: reedify *once* in R 3. III, 1, 71.

Jones says on p. 41 that two *e*'s placed in juxtaposition may or may not be sounded separately in the words *Admeel*, *Beersheba*, *eleemosynary*, *Galilee*, *Jesreel*, *preelection*, *preeminence*, *preemption*, *reenter*, *reestablish*, *reexist*, and *Zebedee*.

A century and upwards before this, we find in print, for instance,

Who him r'encountring fierce, as hauke in flight,  
Spenser F. Q. I, 11, 477 (Repr. Spens. Soc.).

Oft he re'nforst, and oft his forces fayld,

*Id.* *ibid.* II, 4, 127 (Repr. Spens. Soc.).

. . . ., no not thoughe with diligence ye go aboute to  
renforce the same againe.

*J. Cheke* The hurt of sedicion 1549, p. 100.

So that it is all but sure that in the line

Which, since, succeeding ages have re-edified.

R 3. III, 1, 71.

the editor of the Quarto, for the moment oblivious of the optional "short" pronunciation of *reedify*, has foisted in two supernumerary syllables by interpolating *have*. For more detailed information on this point we must refer the reader to W. Sh. Prosody & Text.

## II. 3. ei.

M. *full*: reiterate *once*.

M. *short*: atheist 4*t*.

Sh. *full*: reiterate *once*.

Jones states on p. 42 that in the words *Atheist* and *Atheism* the letters *ei* constitute one syllable, just as in *deceive*, etc. A century earlier we find in print:

And Katherine de Medicis, whose Athisme wrought much woe.—  
W. Warner, Albions England 1597, p. 257.

## II. 4. eo.

*M. full*: Briareos *once*; Cleombrotus *once*; [Mæonides *once*; Mæotis *once*].

*M. short*: dungeon 11 *t.*; Gibeon *once*; Gideon *twice*; habergeon *once*; meteor *once*; Simeon *twice*.

*Sh. full*: Chameleon *once* in III H 6. III, 2, 191; Cleomenes 4 *t.*; dungeon *once* in R 3. I, 2, 111; Leonati *twice*; Leonato 5 *t.*, *e. g.* Ado I, 1, 296; Leonatus 11 *t.*; Leontes 7 *t.*; meteor *twice* in John V, 2, 53 and I H 4. V, 1, 19; Pantheon *once* in T. A. I, 1, 333; preoccupy *once*; pre-ordinance *once*; Romeo 24 *t.*, *e. g.* R. & J. II, 1, 7; surgeon *once* in O. V, 1, 30.<sup>1)</sup>

*Sh. short*: dudgeon *once*; dungeon 5 *t.*, *e. g.* L.L.L. IV, 3, 255; gudgeon *once*; Labeo *once*; Leonardo *once*; Leonato 3 *t.*, *e. g.* Ado IV, 1, 246; meteor 5 *t.*, *e. g.* John III, 4, 157; Pantheon *once* in T. A. I, 1, 242; pigeon 4 *t.*; Romeo 82 *t.*, *e. g.* R. & J. II, 1, 3; scutcheon *twice*; surgeon 8 *t.*, *e. g.* O. V, 1, 100; truncheon 4 *t.*

In the words *Leonato* and *Leonardo*, while they have the primary accent on the third syllable, the first syllable always has more stress than the second, so that in "short" pronunciation it was the vowel-sound of the second syllable

<sup>1)</sup> *Rod.* O, villian that I am!

*Oth.*

Hark, it is

E'en so.

*Cass.* O, help, ho, light! a surgëon!

of these words that got lost. This has also led to the modern pronunciation of *Leonard* and *leopard*.

The pronunciation of *dungeon* and *surgeon* with an additional medial syllable is by Jones mentioned on p. 42, where he gives ten other words ending in *-geon* or *-cheon* that fall under the same rule.

The exact nature of the "short" pronunciation of *Labeo* and *Romeo* has remained a mystery to us. Perhaps it is safest to assume analogy with *Pharao*, sounded *Pharo*.

The optional syncopation of *meteor* is referred to on p. 80 of Jones's book. Besides we have found in print

Of Met'ors, and who lists therein to looke,  
J. Taylor, Drinke and welcome, 1637, p. 25. (Repr. Spens. Soc.)  
and Owen Price, in 1668, gives *meteor* and *metre* as words  
"of like sound" (Ellis, p. 1027).

As regards *Pantheon*, in cases where this word occurs "short" in Shakespeare, we actually find it spelt without *e* both in the Quarto and the Folio, the spelling in both being *Pathan*. The dropping out of the medial *n* in this word, which was unknown to the printers, may be readily accounted for by the latter overlooking the small dash over the *a*, representing this *n* in the manuscript. Where the "full" pronunciation is required, the *e* is found in print; the line stands thus in the Q:

Ascend faire Queene: Pantheon Lords accompany

For all practical purposes the reading in the Folio is substantially the same, and there is not the least reason for proposing emendations in this line, or for adopting them when made, as is the usual practice in this case. What objection can there be to looking upon *Pantheon* as used adjectively? The metre, too, is unexceptionable, but we must of course read *accomp'ny*, just as, for example, in

Comes Elenor, accompned with a crew of Ladies more,  
W. Warner, Albions England, 1597, p. 292.

The syncopations *Gib'on* and *Gid'on* need cause no difficulty, if we remember that even in our day *Simon* is a twin form of *Simeon*, and that the historian of the Decline and Fall is more likely to have derived his patronymic from some ancestor who had gone to the Old Testament for his surname, than from the French name of *Hylobates lar*.

## II. 5. eou.

**M. short:** advantageous *once*; atheous *once*; beauteous 3*t.*; bounteous 5*t.*; courageous *once*; courteous *once*; duteous *once*; erroneous 3*t.*; gorgeous 8*t.*; ethereous *once*; hideous 16*t.*; miscellaneous *once*; outrageous 4*t.*; outrageously *once*; piteous 3*t.*; plenteous 4*t.*; plenteously *once*; righteous 10*t.*; righteousness 12*t.*; spontaneous *once*; tartareous *once*; umbrageous *once*; unrighteous *once*.

**Sh. full:** beauteous *once* in Shrew I, 2, 86; bounteous *once* in O. III, 3, 7; gorgeous *once* in Lear II, 4, 271; hideous *once* in Wives IV, 4, 34.

**Sh. short:** advantageous *once*; beauteous 38*t.*, *e. g.* Venus 365; bounteous 18*t.*, *e. g.* Sonn. 4, 6; bounteously *once*; courageous 5*t.*; courageously *twice*; courteous 15*t.*; courteously *once*; dispiteous *once*; duteous 11*t.*; erroneous *twice*; gorgeous 9*t.*, *e. g.* R. & J. III, 2, 85; hideous 19*t.*, *e. g.* Sonn. 12, 2; hideously *once*; hideousness *once*; outrageous 8*t.*; piteous 24*t.*; piteously *twice*; plenteous 10*t.*; plenteously *once*; righteous 6*t.*; uncourteous *once*; unduteous *once*; unrighteous *once*.

On p. 42 Jones says that the sound of *e* is written *eu*, "In *gorgeous*, and when *tous* is written *teous*; which see". On p. 80 Jones says that the sound of *o* is written *eo*, "Always in *teous*, sounded *tous* in the End of Words; as *beauteous*, *courteous*, etc. And in *gorgeous*, *hideous*". And immediately after this, that the sound of *o* is written *eu*, "Always when *tos* or *teous* in the End of Words, may be sounded *teous*, as in *righteous*, etc." On p. 86 he says that the sound of *os* is written *eous*, "In all that may be sounded *tous* or *teous*, and in *gorgeous*, *hideous*." And finally, he says on p. 117 that the sound of *us* is written *eous*, "when it may be sounded *eous*, as in *gorgeous*, *hideous*, and in the sound of *teous* in the End of Words; as *beauteous*, etc."

From this it follows that the letter-group *eous* might be sounded either in two syllables, or (by quasi-syncopation) in one syllable. We also find, from Jones's mentioning the sound of the different letters *e*, *o*, and *u*, — we repeat that Jones does not make use of phonetic transcriptions — that the indefinite vowel-sound would represent the correct pronunciation.

We besides learn that the modern synizetic pronunciation of *righteous* was unknown to Jones. He distinctly states the pronunciation to be *righte-os*, or *right-tos*.

In Chaucer and Gower the letter-groups *eis* and *ous* in *ourteis*, *hidous*, *pitous*, and their derivatives are invariably monosyllabic. In the later pronunciation of these three words an intrusive medial syllable, which had come into optional use already before Shakespeare's time, has firmly established itself, and completely ousted the old pronunciation in two syllables.

The old form of *righteous* was *rightwise*; after the *w*

had dropped out in pronunciation, the unstressed vowel lost its distinctive character, so that the sound of the whole word became what Jones, as late as the beginning of the eighteenth century, recorded as the more usual pronunciation of the word *righteous*.

The spelling *rightous* is found in print, e. g. in

Then shall God doo wonderfull miracles in Englande, to declare howe mercy shall triumphe ouer rightousnes.

*Th. Lever*, Sermons, 1550 (Repr. Arber p. 58).

The spelling *rightousnes* is repeatedly met with in Lever's Sermons; we also found:

. . . . to se at this tyme all suche thynges as yet remain out of ordre, rightously, spedely, and charitably redressed.

*Th. Lever*, Sermons, 1550 (Repr. Arber p. 82).

The present spelling of the word *righteous* is a remnant of the old trisyllabic pronunciation, but its modern pronunciation has been developed from the dissyllabic form with change of *t* into *ch*, as in the word *nature*.

*Bounteous* and *plenteous* were trisyllabic in Chaucer and Gower in the forms *bountevous* (Old Fr. *bontif*) and *plentevous* (Old Fr. *plentivose*); in these two words we have therefore optional true syncopation in the sixteenth century.

In *outrageous* the ending was monosyllabic also in Chaucer.

Syncopic pronunciation of *beauteous* is found figured in print in

Thirst not for gold. Sweete, beautous Jane, whats mine

*Th. Dekker*, The Shoemakers Holiday IV, 1, 54 (Repr. Warnke).

## II. 6. eus.

M. *short*: Morpheus *once*; Nereus *twice*; Orpheus *3t.*;  
Phineus *once*; Proteus *once*;

Sh. *full*: Proteus *16t.*, e. g. Gent. I, 1, 1; Theseus *twice*,  
e. g. M. N. D. II, 1, 76.

Sh. *short*: Doreus *once* (?); Orpheus *4t.*; Perseus *twice*;

Prometheus *once*; Proteus 34 *t.*, *e. g.* Gent. I, 1, 12; Tereus 5 *t.*; Theseus 8 *t.*, *e. g.* M. N. D. I, 1, 20; Thyreus *twice*.

In Chaucer this *-eus* is always dissyllabic in *Peleus*, *Tereus*, and *Theseus*. In Gower it is dissyllabic in *Perseus*, *Prometheus*, *Proteus*, *Tereus*, and *Theseus*, but of *Perseus* we also find the variant form *Perse*.

In Shakespeare's time, besides meeting with the "full" pronunciation of *-eus*, we have copious evidence of the seeming apocopation of the *-us* ending in this case. We say "seeming apocopation", because these shortened names are of course derived from the French, whereas the "full" pronunciation is based on their Latin form, and the Greek forms are out of the question altogether. The differences we meet with in the various modes of figuring the "short" pronunciation are very interesting:

The horned oxen, backe againe to Orphey ward they went,  
A. Golding, *Metamorph.* 1587, p. 140 bis.

Said: Pelie Pelie I doo bring sad tidings unto thee:  
Declare it man (quoth Peleus) what ever thing it bee.

*Id. ibid.* p. 145.

And Persey bearing in his hand the monster Gorgons head,  
*Id. ibid.* p. 60 bis.

Unstable Protew changing ay his figure and his hue,  
*Id. ibid.* p. 17.

Theseu: for foorthwith reverence the thundrer, shall my hande,  
*Jasp. Heywood, Hercules furens* (Repr. Spens. Soc. p. 32).

The form *Tereu* is found in *The Passionate Pilgrim*, line 386.

We have not found the least shred of evidence for the synoptic pronunciations *Morph'us*, *Prot'us*, etc. in Shakespeare's time, so that we cannot assume it for Shakespeare's metre; but we incline to think that there is some likelihood of its occurrence in Milton. Direct evidence of it in Milton

we have found none, but strong analogies certainly point this way. In the third and fourth Shakespeare Folios of 1663 and 1685, we, for instance, find the spelling *Terus* in Cym. II, 2, 45, whereas the earlier Folios have *Tereus*.

### III. 1. ia.

**M. full:** amiable 3*t.*<sup>1)</sup>; amiably *once*; appropriating *once* (?); Briareos *once*; burial *once* in S.A. 104; Diana *once*; expiate 3*t.*; expiation *once*; Golia(t)h *once*; Guiana *once*; iambic *once*; in-expiable *once*; Margiana *once*; mediation *once*; Mediator *once* in P.L. X, 60; sociable *once*; sociably *once*; Sogdiana *once*; suppliant *twice*, e. g. P.L. X, 917; Susiana *once*; T(i)resias *once*; variable *once* (?).

**M. short:** Adiabene *once*; Adria *once*; Æolian *once*; allegiance *twice*; Amazonian *once*; ambrosia *once*; ambrosial 13*t.*; Ammonian *once*; Aonian *once*; Appian *once*; Arabian 4*t.*; Arachosia *once*; Arcadia *once*; Arcadian *once*; Arimaspiian *once*; Asia *twice*; Asian *once*; associate 5*t.*; Assyria *twice*; Assyrian 4*t.*; Athenian *twice*; Atropatia *once*; Ausonian *once*; auxiliar *once*; Babylonian *once*; Bactrian *once*; Belial 7*t.*; bestial 4*t.*; burial *once* in Ep. M.W. 32; Cæcias *once*; Calabria *once*; Campanian *once*; Carpathian *once*; Carthaginian *once*; carriage *once*; Caspia *twice*; cassia *twice*; Castalian *once*; celestial 36*t.*; Cimmerian *once*; connubial *once*; cordial 3*t.*; Cronian *once*; Cynthia *twice*; Cyriack *twice*; dalliance 4*t.*;

---

<sup>1)</sup> P.L. IV, 250 and IX, 899 are not absolutely sure; we have assumed synalephe in these lines, a figure of which Milton is very fond; but "short" pronunciation of *amiable* is quite possible.

Damiata *once*; Delia *twice*; Delphian *once*; demoniac *twice*; demonian *once*; Dorian *twice*; Egyptian *3 t.*; Elysian *4 t.*; Emathian *twice*; Emilian *once*; Equinoctial *3 t.*; essential *twice*; Ethiopian *once*; Etrurian *once*; expatiate *once*; familiar *4 t.*; filial *8 t.*; Fontarabia *once*; Gallia *once*; genial *4 t.*; Gordian *twice*; Gorgonian *twice*; Grecian *once*; guardian *3 t.*; Hesperian *5 t.*; historian *once*; humiliation *4 t.*; Hyrcanian *once*; Iberian *3 t.*; Illyria *once*; immediate *6 t.*; immediately *4 t.*; impartial *once*; imperial *9 t.*; infuriate *once*; India *twice*; Indian *6 t.*; insatiable *once* (?); insatiate *twice*; intelligential *twice*; Ionian *once*; irradiance *once*; irradiate *once*; Ismenian *once*; Italian *once*; Kiriathaim *once*; Lavinia *once*; Lesbian *once*; luxuriant *once*; Lydian *once*; Macedonian *once*; Madian *once*; magician *twice*; marriage *9 t.*; marriageable *once*; martial *twice*; material *3 t.*; matrimonial *twice*; Media *twice*; Mediator *once* in P.L. XII, 240; Memmonian *once*; memorial *4 t.*; Memphian *3 t.*; meridian *3 t.*; Midian *once*; myriad *5 t.*; Norwegian *once*; nuptial *12 t.*; Œchalia *once*; officiate *once*; Olympian *twice*; Olympias *once*; opiate *once*; Parliament *once*; Parthian *8 t.*; partial *once*; Patriarch *5 t.*; peculiar *6 t.*; Persian *twice*; Pharian *once*; Philistia *once*; Philistian *9 t.*; Phoenician *once*; Plutonian *once*; politician *once*; propitiation *once*; Pythian *twice*; Quintilian *once*; radiance *once*; radiant *17 t.*; Russian *twice*; Sarmatian *once*; satiate *5 t.*; sciential *once*; Scythian *3 t.*; Seleucia *twice*; Serbonian

*once*; Setia *once*; Sicilian *once*; Sidonian *once*; social *once*; solstitial *once*; special 3*t.*; Stygian 7*t.*; substantial *twice*; substantially *once*; superficially *once*; suppliant *once* in P.L. I, 112; Syrian 5*t.*; terrestrial 4*t.*; theologian *once*; Thessalian *once*; Thracian *once*; Thrascias *once*; Timnian *once*; Titanian *once*; tragœdian *once*; transubstantiate *once*; Trinacrian *once*; trivial 4*t.*; Tyrian *twice*; unessential *once*; unsubstantial *once*; Urania *twice*; valiant 3*t.*; variance *once*; venial *once*; vitiate *twice*; Zodiac *twice*.

Sh. *full*: Adriana 3*t.*; Adriatic *once*; Æmilia 3*t.*; alliance 3*t.* in I H 6. V, 5, 43; H 8. I, 2, 62; and Lear I, 1, 170<sup>1)</sup>); amiable 4*t.*, *e. g.* Ad V, 4, 48; Antiates 3*t.*, *e. g.* Cor. I, 6, 53; Ariadne *twice*; arithmetician *once*; Armenian *once* in A. & C. III, 6, 14; Asia *twice*; associate *once* in Cor. IV, 6, 76; Athenian *twice* in M.N.D. III, 2, 41, and Timon V, 1, 131; Austria *once* in John II, 1, 1; Bassianus 20*t.*; Belgia *once*; bezonian *once* in II H 6. IV, 1, 134; Bianca 39*t.*; burial 7*t.*, *e. g.* in T.A. I, 1, 84; calumniate *twice*; carriage 3*t.* in R. & J. I, 4, 94; H 8. IV, 2, 145; and Tim. III, 2, 88<sup>2)</sup>); Celia *twice*; Charmian 3*t.* in A. & C. I, 5, 18; IV, 15, 83; and V, 2, 226; Christian 4*t.* in M. of V. I, 3, 43; IV, 1, 387; R 3. III, 5, 26, and H 8. V, 3, 180; Cimmerian

<sup>1)</sup> See W. Sh. Pros. & Text, p. 381 (l. 155).

<sup>2)</sup> And honourable carriage, had his  
Necessity made use of me, I would  
Have put my wealth into donation,

*once*; Cornelia *once* in T.A. IV, 2, 141; Crispian(us) 5 *t.*; dalliance 3 *t.*, *e. g.* Tp. IV, 1, 51; Dalmatian *once* in Cym. III, 7, 3; diablo *once*; diameter *once*; Diana 17 *t.*; expiate *twice*; familiar 3 *t.* in Ado V, 4, 70; R. & J. III, 3, 6; and J.C. III, 1, 266; familiarity *once* in W.T. II, 1, 175; Fulvia *once* in A. & C. II, 2, 94; Gallia *once* in Cym. I, 6, 201; Gratiano 8 *t.*, *e. g.* M. of V. I, 1, 107; Hermia 8 *t.*, *e. g.* M.N.D. I, 1, 23; Hesperia *once*; Iago 47 *t.*; Illyria *once* in Tw.N. I, 2, 3; imperial *once* in H 5. IV, 1, 278; India *twice*, *e. g.* M.N.D. II, 1, 69; insociable *once*; Ionia *once*; Julia 3 *t.*, *e. g.* Gent. V, 4, 98; Lavinia 6 *t.*, *e. g.* T.A. II, 2, 16; Luciana *twice*; Lycaonia *once*; Lydia *twice*; Mardian *once* in A. & C. II, 5, 4; Mariana *once* in M. f. M. IV, 1, 49; marriage 11 *t.* in Lucr. 221; Ado V, 4, 30; Shrew III, 2, 142; I H 6. V, 1, 21; V, 5, 55; III H 6. III, 3, 57; R. & J. IV, 1, 11; V, 3, 241; V, 3, 265; O. III, 3, 268; Per. II, 3, 30; mediation *twice*; mediator *twice*; Mercurial *once*; musician *twice* in R 2. I, 3, 288, and I H 4. III, 1, 235; nuptial *twice* in Tp. V, 1, 308, and M.N.D. V, 1, 75; Octavia 3 *t.*, *e. g.* A. & C. II, 5, 60; Ophelia *once* in Ham. IV, 5, 158; Parthia *twice*, *e. g.* A. & C. II, 2, 15; partial *once* in Tr. & Cr. II, 2, 178; periapts *once*; physician 3 *t.*, *e. g.* R 2. I, 1, 154; Portia 7 *t.*, *e. g.* J.C. IV, 3, 166; reconciliation *once*; Rialto *once*; Russia *once* in M. f. M. II, 1, 139; Sardians *once*; sciatic(a) *once*; Silvia 6 *t.*, *e. g.*

Gent. V, 4, 125; sociable *once* in John III, 4, 65; substantial *once* in R. & J. II, 2, 141; suppliant *twice* in Gent. III, 1, 234, and R 3. I, 1, 74; Syria 3*t.*, *e. g.* A. & C. V, 2, 200; tarriance *once* in Gent. II, 7, 90; Titania *twice*, *e. g.* M.N.D. II, 1, 60; unfilial *once*; unreconciliable *once*; valiant 8*t.* in Gent. IV, 3, 13; R 2. I, 3, 83<sup>1)</sup>; II H 4. II, 3, 25; H 5. IV, 1, 46; IV, 7, 187; R 3. I, 2, 245; Tr. & Cr. II, 3, 243; and Tim. III, 5, 47; variable *twice*, *e. g.* Ham. III, 1, 180; variation *twice*; William *once* (?) in R 3. III, 1, 162.<sup>2)</sup>

Sh. *short*: aerial *once*; Alexandria 5*t.*; Alexandrian *twice*; allegiance 18*t.*, *e. g.* W. T. II, 3, 121; allegiant *once*; Amazonian *twice*; amiable *once* in O. III, 4, 59; Antiates *once* in Cor. I, 6, 59; Antoniad *once*; Arabia 4*t.*; Arabian 4*t.*; Armenia *once* in A. & C. III, 6, 35; artificial 6*t.*; associate 3*t.*, *e. g.* T. A. V, 3, 169; Assyrian *twice*; Athenian 20*t.*, *e. g.* M. N. D. I, 1, 12; Austria 3*t.*, *e. g.* John III, 1, 114; barbarian *once* (?); battalia *twice*; beneficial *twice*; bestial *twice*; bezonian *once* in II H 4. V, 3, 119; Bohemia 15*t.*; burial 10*t.*, *e. g.* R 2. V, 5, 119; Calphurnia 7*t.*; Cambria *once*; Cappadocia *once*; carriage 11*t.*, *e. g.* Errors III, 2, 14; celestial 19*t.*; ceremonial *once*; Charmian 20*t.*, *e. g.* A. & C. I, 3, 15; Christian 48*t.*, *e. g.* Errors I,

---

<sup>1)</sup> Rouse up thy youthful blood, be valiant,  
And live!

*Bol.* Mine in'cence and Saint George to thrive!

Q. and F. both read *innocence*; *innocency* is Capell's conjecture.—

<sup>2)</sup> T'make William Lord Hastings of our mind, (?)

2, 77; Cilicia *once*; circumstantial *once*; comedian *once*; Cordelia 16*t.*; cordial 9*t.*; Cornelia *once* in T.A. IV, 1, 12; Cynthia 3*t.*; dalliance 4*t.*, *e. g.* Ham. I, 3, 50; Dalmatian *once* in Cym. III, 1, 74; Dardanian *once*; denunciation *once*; Egyptian 13*t.*; Emilia 12*t.*; especial 3*t.*; especially 4*t.*; essential *once*; essentially *once*; Fabian *once*; familiar 20*t.*, *e. g.* Sonn. 86, 9; familiarly 3*t.*; filial 4*t.*; Fulvia 13*t.*, *e. g.* A. & C. I, 1, 20; Gallia 11*t.*, *e. g.* Cym. II, 4, 18; Gallian *twice*; galliard *once*; Gilliams *once*; Gordian *twice*; Gratiano 6*t.*, *e. g.* M. of V. I, 1, 58; Grecian 37*t.*; guardian 4*t.*; Helias *once*; Hermia 35*t.*, *e. g.* M.N.D. I, 1, 67; Hyrcania *once*; Iachimo 6*t.*; Illyria *once* in Tw.N. I, 2, 2 (?)<sup>1)</sup>; Illyrian *once*; immediacy *once*; immediate 13*t.*; immediately 20*t.*; impartial 5*t.*; imperial 24*t.*, *e. g.* H 5. I, 2, 35; India 3*t.*, *e. g.* Tr. & Cr. I, 1, 103; Indian 7*t.*; initiate *once*; insatiate 4*t.*; insubstantial *once*; Ionian *once*; Italian 9*t.*; jovial 4*t.*; Julia 23*t.*, *e. g.* Gent. I, 1, 66; Lavinia 36*t.*, *e. g.* T.A. I, 1, 52; Livia *once*; Lucretia 3*t.*; Machiavel 2*t.*; magician 3*t.*; Marcians *once*; Mardian 3*t.*, *e. g.* A. & C. I, 5, 8; Marrian(a) 5*t.*, *e. g.* M. f. M. IV, 3, 145; marriage 79*t.*, *e. g.* Sonn. 116, 1; martial 9*t.*; material 4*t.*; Media *twice*; memorial 3*t.*; meridian *once*; Mesopotamia *once*; musician 11*t.*, *e. g.* M. of V. V, 1, 106; negotiation *once*;

<sup>1)</sup> Vio. What country, friends, is this?

Cap.

This 'Lyria, lady.

van Dam & Stoffel, Chapters.

nuptial 15 *t.*, *e. g.* M.N.D. I, 1, 125; Octavia 14 *t.*, *e. g.* A. & C. II, 2, 121; official *once*; Olivia 7 *t.*; Olympian *twice*; Ophelia 14 *t.*, *e. g.* Ham. I, 3, 33; palliament *once*; Pannonian *twice*; Parisians *once*; parliament 16 *t.*; Parthia 5 *t.*, *e. g.* A. & C. II, 3, 32; Parthian 5 *t.*; partial 6 *t.*, *e. g.* R. 2. I, 3, 241; partialize *once*; partially *twice*; patrician 12 *t.*; peculiar 8 *t.*; penitential *once*; Perigenia *once*; Persia *once*; Persian *once*; Pharsalia *once*; Phœnicia *once*; Phœnician *once*; Phrygia *once*; Phrygian 5 *t.*; physician 20 *t.*, *e. g.* Lucr. 904; politician *twice*; poniard *twice*; Portia 16 *t.*, *e. g.* M. of V. I, 1, 165; potential 3 *t.*; preceptial *once*; prejudicial *once*; radiance 3 *t.*; radiant 7 *t.*; remediate *once*; ruffian 17 *t.*; Russia *once* in W.T. III, 2, 120; Russian 7 *t.*; sacrificial *once*; Sardinia *once*; Scythia *twice*; Scythian *twice*; Sebastian 11 *t.*; Sicilia 7 *t.*; Sicilian *once*; Silvia 38 *t.*, *e. g.* Gent. II, 6, 2; sociable *twice*, *e. g.* Tp. V, 1, 63; Spaniard *twice*; special 29 *t.*; specially *once*; specialty 3 *t.*; Stygian *once*; substantial 3 *t.*, *e. g.* Sonn. 1, 6; superficial *once*; superficially *once*; suppliant 6 *t.*, *e. g.* Lucr. 897; Syracusian 7 *t.*; Syria 3 *t.*, *e. g.* A. & C. III, 6, 10; tarriance *once* in Pilgr. 74; terrestrial *once*; Thaliard 4 *t.*; Thessalian *once*; Thracian 5 *t.*; Timbria *once*; Titania 6 *t.*, *e. g.* M.N.D. II, 1, 119; tragedian *once*; trivial 5 *t.*; Tyrian *twice*; unpartial *once*; unsubstantial *twice*; Valeria *twice*; valiant 102 *t.*, *e. g.* Compl. 245; valiantly 3 *t.*; valiantness *once*; variable *twice*,

*e. g.* Venus 967; Venetian 6*t.*; venial *once*; villiagio *once*; Volscian 7*t.*; Volumnia *once*; William 17*t.*, *e. g.* R 3. III, 1, 181; zodiac *twice*.

In Shakespeare's and in Milton's time the "short" pronunciation of the ending *-ia* was undoubtedly brought about by apocopation, as is proved by the very numerous spellings *-ie*, *-y*, or *-ye*, of which it is needless to give instances.

In Milton the "full" pronunciation of this ending does not occur; we find the spelling *-ia* there in cases in which the syllable immediately preceding has the primary stress, *e. g.* *Arcádia*; and *-ie* or *-y*, if the accent is thrown further back, as, for instance, in *Arcady*.

In Shakespeare this rule would also seem to hold good, as we see from the spellings *Sicllia* and *Stcily*, with the sole exception of W.T. IV, 4, 599, where the First Folio reads *Sicilia*, which, however, already the second Folio corrects to *Sicily*.

If we mistake not, the *-ia* ending occurs in Gower, only in *Bethincia* and *Ylia*; in the remaining cases this ending is there represented, either by a dissyllabic *-ie*, as in *Armenie*, *Aste*, *Barbarie*, *Marie*, etc., or by *-e*, as in *Ethiôpe*, *Pérse*, *Ytaïle*, etc. On the whole the same state of things is found in Chaucer, only the spelling is less regular. It is highly interesting to find Chaucer using two forms of the same word, *e. g.* *Ruce* and *Russye* (trisyllabic), *Libie* and *Libye*.

These different forms of course go to prove that the words in question were introduced into English from the French, and not from the Latin.

The "short" pronunciation that prevailed two centuries after Chaucer and Gower's time, had been regularly deve-

loped from the *-te* or *-ye* form, by the dropping of the final *e*, and the concomitant throwing back of the syllabic accent.

At the same time, however, writers and speakers began to show an increasing proclivity to modify the original French spelling and pronunciation of this class of words in the direction of the Latin, until in our time the Latinising spelling has also determined the pronunciation. A small number of words, all of them of very frequent occurrence however, have resisted the change, or have been only partially affected by it; compare such instances as *the Indian Mary*, etc.

The optional dropping of the *i* (and at the same time also the optional medial syllable *i* in *carriage*, etc.) are on p. 24 of Jones's book registered for the following words: "*carriage*, *Christian*, (*diamond*), *Marriage*, *Parliament*, *Spaniard*, *VALIANT WILLIAM*, etc."

And on p. 44 for the following: "*aviary*, *breviary*, *carriage*, (*diary*), *Christian*, *fustian*, *guardian*, *Indian*, *Italian*, *Marriage*, *Parliament*, *Spaniard*, etc."

The loss of the *i* in pronunciation is further shown by the following rhymes:

On which he blew as strong a Levet,  
As well-fee'd Lawyer on his Breviate.

Hudibras, II Part, 1664, p. 111.

And suffer'd your own Tribe of Christians,  
To fall before as true Philistines.

Id. III Part, 1678, p. 167.

But with the Moon was more familiar  
Then e're was Almanack-well-willer.

Id. II Part, 1664, p. 148.

And has observ'd all fit Decorums,  
We find describ'd by old Historians.

Id. id. p. 115.

The Knight, by Damnable Magician,  
Being cast illegally in Prison;  
(read: be'ng)

Id. id. p. 1.

Your Modern Indian Magician

Makes but a hole in th'earth to piss in,

Id. id. p. 175.

The Gallenist, and Paracelsian,

Condemn the way, each other deals in.

Id. III Part, 1678, p. 221.

When all their fierce contests for Forrage,

Conclude in Articles of Marriage?

Id. id. p. 50.

His head and ears, which in the Martial

Encounter lost a leathern parcel.

Id, I Part, 1663, p. 174.

And made me mount upon the bare-ridge,

T'avoid a wretcheder miscarriage:

Id. III Part, 1678, p. 233.

'Twas nothing so, both sides were ballanc't

So equal, none knew which was valiant'st.

Id. I Part, 1663, p. 133.

The Active, and the Passive valiant;

Both which are pari librâ gallant:

Id. id. p. 241.

Of phonetic spellings that point the same way, we cite the following:

Billards A. & C. II, 5, 3, F.; Christen: I H 4. II, 1, 19 & 4, 8, Q., Ham. V, 1, 32, Q.; Machiuell Wives III, 1, 104, F.; Macheuill III H 6. III, 2, 193, F.; Macheville I H 6. V, 4, 74, F.; Philippan A. & C. II, 5, 23, F.; ruffin, see pp. 116 ff.

..... whose parents were said to be, the one celestall, the other mortall;

*Drayton*, Engl. Her. Epist. To the Read. (Repr. Spens. Soc. p. 166).

..... neyther could I ever find any sensible difference betwixt a Cuckold and a Christen creature.

*G. Chapman*, Al Fooles, 1605, p. 43.

This manner vers the Comidantz<sup>1</sup>) and tragike bothe begun Queen *Elizabeth's* Englishings, 1598 (E.E.T.S. p. 145).

---

<sup>1</sup>) Comidantz = Comedians. Excrescent *t* after *n* — see, for instance, the word "guardents" in the next passage but one — is of very frequent occurrence. We must not omit to add, that this quotation

A Guárden, custos, odis, hic.

*P. Levins*, Manipulus Vocabulorum (Repr. E.E.T.S., col. 61).  
That should have Angels guardents on your throne.

*Th. Heywood*, Rape of Lucr. (Repr. Pearson, Vol. V, p. 234).  
Then upon Livy, did old Machavill.

*W. Habington*, Castara, (Repr. Arb. p. 96).

An Epigram on Willam Lord Burl: Lo: high Treasurer of  
England.

*Ben Jonson*, Second Folio, Vol. II, Underwoods, p. 198.

In the following three words the old optional syncopation  
has become the only admissible pronunciation of our day:

And, of his Carrage, Christo-fer should thenceforth be his name.

*W. Warner*, Albions England, 1597, p. 231.

Nor can this spoile my Marr'age being knowne.

*G. Wither*, Juvenilia, 1626 (Repr. Spens. Soc. p. 649).

Since nor his Parl'aments, Thy Lawes, nor His,

*G. Wither*, Vox Pacifica, 1645 (Repr. Spens. Soc. p. 164).

In his book *A special help to Orthographie etc.* 1643,  
Richard Hodges admits the pair *garden*, *guardian* to his list  
of words "which are so neer alike in sound, as that they  
are sometimes taken one for another" (Ellis, p. 1022).

In 1668, Owen Price in the list of "Words of Like  
Sound" in his book *The Art of right spelling, etc.*, besides  
registering *guardian* and *garden*, also mentions the four words  
following, marking, however, the difference of stress between  
the first pair and the second (Ellis, p. 1024):

"*alás* ough, wo is me, a *Lass*, *álías*, *aloes*."

And on p. 1027 Ellis cites from the same list:

"*Palate*, *palliate*, *pallet* a little low bed to be roled up."

The second Quarto of *Othello* has in II, 1, 39 the re-  
markable misprint "Ayre all blue" for *aerial blue*, which can  
of course readily be accounted for on the basis of the non-  
pronunciation of the *i* in *aerial*.

---

from the "Englishings", like the three others on p. 159, is in the Queen's  
own handwriting, not in that of her clerk.

Of course, where cases of optional non-pronunciation of the *i*-syllable in certain positions were of so frequent occurrence, we may safely expect to find from the written or printed forms that conversely this *i* was apt to intrude in pronunciation in certain analogous positions, where it was inorganic.

In Chaucer and Gower the word *Christian* is always a dissyllable written *Cristen*. In the sixteenth century the word *Cristen* was refashioned with *ch*-, and its written form assimilated to the Latin, as *Christian*. In course of time this intrusive *i* came to be optionally pronounced as a separate syllable, as we have seen from Shakespeare, and, consonantised by synizesis, it is true, it has held its own down to our day.

The word *valiant* is found twice in Gower, as *vailant*:

‘Vailant, vailant, lo, wher he goth!’

Conf. Amantis IV, 1633 (Ed. Macaulay).

In Shakespeare's time there were various other words in which an intrusive *i* was optionally pronounced. This can be actually proved with regard to the word *villain*, because we can adduce the concurrent evidence of the spelling, of a word-play, and of the trisyllabic pronunciation as required by the metre.

Printed *vilian*, the word occurs in Sir John Cheke's *The Hurt of Sedicion*, etc. p. 26; and, for instance, in R. & J. I, 5, 66 Second Folio.

The word-play, a piece of absolute evidence by itself, is as follows

#### OF A CERTAYNE CIULLIAN.

Thou calst thy selfe *Ciullian*,  
 thou art not full so muche:  
 If *Ci*. be out, as then remaines  
 in deede thy name is suche.

*Tim. Kendall*, Flowers of Epigr. 1577 (Repr. Spens. Soc. p. 276).

The metre absolutely requires quadrisyllabic pronunciation of the word *Civilian*.

Trisyllabic pronunciation of *villain* is proved by the metre, for instance in:

Stoop. villaine. stoope! stoope! for so he bids

*Marlowe*, I Tamburlaine IV, 2, 21 (Repr. Wagner).

Packe damned ravishers. hence villaines.

*Th. Heywood*, The f. Maid o. the Exch. (Repr. Pearson, Vol. II, p. 8).

We have had the pleasure of meeting with the word *villain* in Shakespearean metre 182 times as a dissyllable, 109 times in prose or absolutely uncertain, and as a trisyllable in the 9 cases following:

Sir, w' are undone; these are the villians

Gent. IV, 1, 5.

Villian, I say, knock me at this gate

Shrew I, 2, 11.

Be'ng thus benetted round with villians,

Ham. V, 2, 29.

*Cas.* O, helëp! [syllabic ɪ]

*Lod.* Hark!

*Rod.*

O wretched villian!

O. V, 1, 39—41.

*Gra.* He's gone, but his wife's killed.

*Mon.*

'Tis a

Notorious villian. Take you this weapon,

O. V, 2, 238 & 239.

O. O, villian!

*Cas.* Most heath'nish and most gross!

O. V, 2, 313.

I will not ask again. Close villian,

Cym. III, 5, 85.

*Sim.* Thou hast bewitch'd my daughter, and thou art  
A villian.

*Per.* By thé gods, I have nót:

Per. II, 5, 50.

Sentence-stress on the article, as in the passage last cited, marks a strong emphasis.

As regards the case in O. V, 1, 29, see p. 134, Note.

This intrusive *i* before *a* we find *inter alia* printed in the word *æillades*, which in the old Shakespeare texts occurs in the forms *aliads*, *eliads*, and *illiads*; in *Alexias* A. & C. I, 2, 89, F.; in *Ariachne* Tr. & Cr. V, 2, 152, Q. and F., where the metre proves it to have been actually pronounced; in *champion* Tw.N. II, 5, 173, F.; in *Syracusians* 7*t.* in *Errors*, F.; in

Hath laid these Christiall pavements, cloathed these meades  
*Th. Heywood*, *Loues Mistris* (Repr. Pearson, Vol. V, p. 110).

and in *Cadméian*, where the *i* constitutes a separate syllable in

The high Cadmeian is in my grace,  
*Th. Heywood*, *The Siluer Age* (Repr. Pearson, Vol. III, p. 147).

On the other hand, the substantive *marshal*, as the name of an officer, occurs several times in the spelling *Martiall* in Heywood's *The Royall King* etc. Conversely we find the adjective *martial* spelt *marshall* in Marlowe's *Edward II*, 1594.

In his list of words of like sound, R. Hodges, 1643, mentions "*Mr. Marshal, martial*" (Ellis, p. 1020).

Here we have come down to the synizetic pronunciation. Just as Jones in 1701 registers the sound *oshan* for *ocean*, he also mentions the following pronunciations:

Pronounced *sha*, written *cia*, in the words *magician*, *beneficial*, *official*;

Pronounced *sha*, written *cia*, in the words *special*, *so-ciable*, *Lucian*, etc.;

Pronounced *sha*, written *scia*, in the word *Priscian*;

Pronounced *sha*, written *sia*, in the words *Parisian*, *Tunesian*.

In addition to this, Jones, besides mentioning on p. 44 of his book the pronunciations *Indian* (3 syll.) and *Indan*,

to which we have referred above on p. 148, states on p. 64 of his treatise that *Indian* is sounded "*injan*".

In Ellis's *Pronouncing Vocabulary of the XVII century*, we are informed that in 1685 Cooper mentions the modern synizetic pronunciation of the words *artificial*, *celestial*, *enthusiasm*, and of "*ti- ante vocalem*".

The cases of interchange of *marshal* and *martial* are irrefragable evidence that in certain words the synizetic pronunciation must already have been in existence in Shakespeare's time. Add to this, that in the surreptitious Quarto of H 5. the word *tertian* is found in the spelling *tashan* in II, 1, 124.

In the seventeenth century, on the other hand, the whole body of evidence in favour of the synizetic pronunciation of words spelt with *ia*, refers exclusively to such words as have *ia* preceded by the *s*-sound, figured by the letters *c*, *s*, *sc*, or *t*, as the case may be.

At the end of the present paper we shall return to the question of synizetic and syncopic pronunciation, when we hope to show that the seeming contradiction between our statements admits of being accounted for in a very simple way

### III. 2. ie.

**M. full:** carrier *once*; conscience *once* in *Mask* [*Comus* 212; *Darien once*; *Gabriel once* in *P.L.* IV 865; *inexperience once*; *Ithuriel twice* in *P.L.* IV, 788 & 868; *sciential once*; *Uriel once* in *P.L.* III, 648.

**M. short:** *Abdiel 5 t.*; *Ariel once*; *Aries once*; *alien twice*; *alienate 4 t.*; *ancient 26 t.*; *anciently once*; *ambient twice*; *audience 8 t.*; *conscience 13 t.*, *e.g.* *P.L.* X, 842; *convenient once*; *Daniel twice*; *deficiency once*; *deficient once*; *disobedience 7 t.*;

disobedient *twice*; envier *once*; experience 10 *t.*; experienced *once*; Ezekiel *once*; Gabriel 12 *t.*, *e. g.* P.L. IV, 549; impatience *once*; inconvenient *once*; ingredient *once*; Ithuriel *once* in P.L. IV, 810; lenient *once*; obedience 25 *t.*; obedient 5 *t.*; omniscient 3 *t.*; orient 13 *t.*; osier *twice*; patience 16 *t.*; patient 3 *t.*; patiently 4 *t.*; prevenient *once*; Ramiel *once*; sapience 3 *t.*; sapient *once*; soldiery *once*; sufficient 11 *t.*; sufficiently *once*; transient *once*; twentieth *once*; unexperienced *twice*; Uriel 8 *t.*, *e. g.* in P.L. III, 654; Uzziel *once*; Zophiel *once*; *-ier* in the comparative degree of 26 different adjectives 63 *t.*; *-iest* in the superlative of 35 different adjectives 92 *t.*

**Sh. full.:** alien *once* in M. of V. IV, 1, 349; ancient *once* in Lear V, 1, 32; Ariel *twice* in Tp. I, 2, 317 & 441; audience 3 *t.* in John IV, 2, 139, II H 4. IV, 1, 76, and Ham. V, 2, 398; carrier *once* in Wives II, 2, 141; conscience 5 *t.* in John IV, 2, 77, H 5. I, 2, 79, H 8. II, 2, 28 & 75, and Tim. III, 2, 94; convenience *once* in Lear III, 6, 106; convenient *twice* in I H 6. II, 4, 4, and Ham. I, 1, 175, Q; Daniel *once* in M. of V. IV, 1, 333; expedience *once* in I H 4. I, 1, 33; experience *twice* in II H 6. V, 1, 171, and T.A. V, 3, 78; impatience 5 *t.* in I H 4. I, 3, 51, I H 6. IV, 7, 8, R 3. II, 2, 38 & IV, 4, 156, and J. C. II, 1, 248; impatient 3 *t.* in Wives III, 4, 75, Shrew Ind. 1, 99, and T.A. II, 1, 76; inconvenience *once* in I H 6. I, 4, 14; Juliet 5 *t.*

in R. & J. II, 6, 2, Q.S., III, 1, 118, V, 3, 73 & 101 & 302; obedience 9*t.* in Shrew Ind. 2, 109, V, 2, 117 & 118 & 153, John IV, 2, 262, V, 1, 9 & 4, 56, I H 6. III, 1, 167, and H 8. III, 1, 162; obedient 3*t.* in Shrew I, 1, 217, V, 2, 67, and O. III, 3, 89; quietus *twice*; patience 26*t.* in Errors III, 1, 94, Ado V, 1, 19 & 281, M.N.D. I, 1, 152 & IV, 1, 61, As I, 3, 80, Shrew I, 2, 239, R 2. V, 2, 33, I H 4. I, 3, 200 & III, 1, 179, II H 6. II, 4, 68, R 3. I, 1, 116<sup>1)</sup> & 3, 248, IV, 1, 15, H 8. IV, 2, 165, Tr. & Cr. I, 2, 4 & V, 2, 64, Cor. III, 1, 191, T.A. V, 3, 126, R. & J. V, 1, 27 & 3, 221 & 261, O. II, 3, 376, A. & C. II, 5, 62, Cym. IV, 2, 58, Per. III, 1, 26; patient 7*t.* in Shrew IV, 1, 179, John V, 7, 11, II H 6. I, 3, 68, III H 6. I, 1, 215, R 3. I, 3, 157 & V, 1, 2, and Per. V, 1, 146; prescience *once* in Tp. I, 2, 180; soldier 14*t.* in Shrew II, 1, 146, A. W. III, 2, 72, I H 4 I, 3, 64, II H 6. III, 1, 328, III H 6. I, 1, 207 & 2, 42, III, 3, 204, IV, 3, 61, Cor. I, 1, 120, V, 6, 71, J. C. IV, 1, 28 & 3, 51, Ham I, 5, 141, and Lear IV, 5, 3; sufficient *once* in III H 6. I, 3, 26; Vienna 4*t.*;

heavier *twice* in II H 4. V, 2, 26, and R 3. III, 1, 121; livelier *once*; worthier *twice* in M.N.D. I, 1, 55 and II H 6. I, 3, 111.

heaviest *once* in Gent. IV, 2, 141; worthiest

---

<sup>1)</sup> I will deli'r you', or lie for you: meantime  
Have patience.

Clar. I must perforce. Farewell.

3 *t.* in A.W. III, 2, 99, John II, 1, 281, and W.T. V, 1, 48.

Sh. *short*: alien *twice*, *e. g.* Sonn. 78, 3; Amiens *once*; ancient 56 *t.*, *e. g.* Lucr. 949; ancient'st *once*; Ariel 15 *t.*, *e. g.* Tp. I, 2, 217; Aries *once*; audience 22 *t.*, *e. g.* Venus 846; burier *once*; carrier *once* in Lucr. 926; clothier *once*; collier *once*; conscience 86 *t.*, *e. g.* Lucr. 247; convenience 3 *t.*, *e. g.* Ham. IV, 7, 150; conveniency *once*; convenient 13 *t.*, *e. g.* M. of V. III, 4, 56; conveniently 4 *t.*; courier 3 *t.*; courtier 16 *t.*; Daniel 4 *t.*, *e. g.* M. of V. IV, 1, 223; deficient *twice*; disobedience 7 *t.*; disobedient 4 *t.*; effigies *once*; expedience 3 *t.*, *e. g.* H 5. IV, 3, 70; expedient 7 *t.*; expediently *once*; experience 12 *t.*, *e. g.* Compl. 152; experienced 6 *t.*; Gabriel *once*; impatience 11 *t.*, *e. g.* Venus 217; impatient 15 *t.*, *e. g.* Ham. I, 2, 96; impatiently 3 *t.*; ingredience + ingredient 3 *t.*; insufficiency *twice*; Juliet 40 *t.*, *e. g.* R. & J. II, 2, 3; Julietta *once*; Labienus *once*; Nathaniel *twice*; obedience 40 *t.*, *e. g.* Lucr. 1215; obedient 24 *t.*, *e. g.* Shrew IV, 1, 199; orient 7 *t.*; osier 4 *t.*; patience 139 *t.*, *e. g.* Sonn. 140, 2; patient 61 *t.*, *e. g.* Lucr. 904; patiently 14 *t.*; préscience *once* in Lucr. 727; requiem *twice*; sapient *once*; soldier 176 *t.*, *e. g.* Venus 893; soldiership 5 *t.*; spaniel 9 *t.*; sufficiency *twice*; sufficient 9 *t.*, *e. g.* Gent. V, 4, 75; sufficiently *twice*; twentieth *twice*; unexperient *once*;

bloodier *once*; costlier *once*; craftier *once*; earthlier *once*; easier 4 *t.*; emptier *once*; good-

lier *twice*; guiltier *twice*; happier 14 *t.*; headier *once*; heavier 9 *t.*, *e. g.* Errors I, 1, 32; holier *twice*; kindlier *once*; lovelier *twice*; luckier *once*; lustier *once*; merrier 5 *t.*; mightier 9 *t.*; prettier *once*; prouder *once*; sorrier *once*; speedier *twice*; statelier *once*; timelier *once*; uglier *twice*; unworthier *once*; verier *once*; weightier 3 *t.*; worthier 10 *t.*, *e. g.* Sonn. 79, 6; bloodiest *once*; chariest *once*; daintiest *twice*; earliest *twice*; eas(i)liest *once*; easiest *once*; goodliest 3 *t.*; happiest 5 *t.*; hardest *once*; heaviest 5 *t.*, *e. g.* Cor. V, 6, 143; holiest *once*; luckiest *once*; lustiest *once*; merriest *twice*; mightiest 7 *t.*; murkiest *once*; prettiest 5 *t.*; readiest 3 *t.*; rudeliest *once*; sorriest *once*; speediest 3 *t.*; ugliest *once*; unworthiest 3 *t.*; veriest 3 *t.*; wealthiest *once*; weariest *once*; worthiest 9 *t.*, *e. g.* John II, 1, 282.

According to Jones, p. 44, *ie* may be pronounced as *e* or as *ie* (2 syll.) in the following words: "*Audience, Brasier, Conscience, crosier, Daniel, experience, Farrier, Furier, Gabriel, Gamaliel, loftier, mightier, Spaniel, terrier, etc.*"

The "short" pronunciation by syncope is proved by the following rhymes:

He could transform himself in Colour

As like the Devil as a Collier;

Hudibras, I Part, 1663, p. 99.

And know 'em both in Soul and Conscience,

Giv'n up t'as Reprobate a Non-sense,

Hudibras, III Part, 1678, p. 135.

The bridge is drawn, the gate is barr'd,

My father he has the keys, sir;

But I have for my love prepar'd

A shorter way and easier.

Percy's Reliques of ancient Engl. Poet. p. 177, Ed. 1872.

Make of thy Deeds, not of thy Dayes, account:  
Think not how far, but think how fair thou passest:  
See to what Summ thy Vertues will amount;  
For, Life and Gold are chose by waight; the massi'st.

*J. Sylvester*, Folio of 1621, p. 1040.

Next, one upon a pair of Panniers  
Full fraught with that, weh for good manners  
*Hudibras*, II Part, 1664, p. 112.

None ever acted both parts bolder,  
Both of a Chieftain and a Souldier.  
Id. I Part, 1663, p. 87.

Through which he drag'd the worsted Soldiers,  
Fore quarters out by th' Head and Shoulders:  
*Hudibras*, III Part, 1678, p. 91.

The synepic pronunciation is further confirmed by the following spellings found in print:

easilest *Cym.* IV, 2, 206, F.; Julet R. & J. I, 3, 47.  
F<sub>1</sub> & F<sub>2</sub> & F<sub>3</sub>, and in several other places; liklest *L.L.L.*  
*IV*, 2, 88, Q.; maidenlest *Lear* I, 2, 143, Q.; [s]pannelled  
*A. & C.* IV, 12, 21, F.; rascaldest *I H* 4. I, 2, 90, F.;  
daintest *Milton*, Vac. Exercise, 14.

[The last two examples are doubtful, since among others  
*Edmund Spenser* has *rascal* as an adjective, and *daint* for  
*dainty* by apocopation.]

Or one in all that Earth affoordz aboundantler that floated,  
*W. Warner*, *Albions England*, 1612, p. 342.

How rightly said is this: "that easilar il than good to  
mortal men arrives,"

Queen *Elizabeth's* Englishings, 1598 (E.E.T.S. p. 128).

That egerlar the firm ther pace and folowe firme,  
Ibid. p. 135.

Upon a Wife, the heavy'r clog  
*Hudibras*, II Part, 1664, p. 47.

Nor hath the other likelihood, for quitler ruleth none.  
*W. Warner*, *Albions England*, 1592, p. 68.

How righlar he, that fondly naught doth vndertake?  
Queen *Elizabeth's* Englishings, 1598 (E.E.T.S. p. 147).

And cause the Soulders that thus honour me  
*Marlowe*, *I Tamburlaine* I, 1, 172. Ed. 1605 (Repr. *Wagner*).

But few Men, when the twentieth Day is past,

*G. Chapman*, The Georgicks of Hesiod, 1618

y° Twentieth, vigesimus.

y° Thirtieth, trigesimus, a.

y° Forteth, quadragismus, a.

y° Fifteth, quinquagesimus, a.

y° Sixteth, sexagesimus, a.

y° Seuenteth, septuagesimus, a.

y° Eighteth, octogesimus, a.

y° Ninteth, nonagesimus, a.

*P. Levins*, Manipulus Vocabulorum, 1570 (Repr. E.E.T.S.)

Ile send then my vant-currer presently:

*Decker & Webster*, North-ward Hoe, 1607 (Repr. Pearson, Vol. II)

Then on the worth'est tract up tow'rds the mid-day

*Drayton*, Poly-Olbion, 1622 (Repr. Spens. Soc. p.)

In Owen Price's Table of Words of like Sound find the pair *banner*, *pannier* (Ellis, p. 1024). Jones mentions the pronunciation *b* for *p*, e. g. *Cubid* for etc. Perhaps it would be exceedingly difficult to find how far this Welsh peculiarity was ever current in England.

Intrusive *i* before *e* in positions of this kind was found *inter alia* in courtiers (= courters) A. & C. 17, F.; drovier Ado II, 1, 202, Q. & F.; flouriet M IV, 1, 58, Q. & F.; student Ham. I, 2, 177 Q., and

... , where I met at Padua thirtie Englishmen at  
I met also . . . . .

*E. Webbe*, His Trauailles, 1590 (Repr. Arber.)

The *i* in the word *spaniel* is also intrusive; according to Skeat, *Etym. Dict.* i. v. it is spelt *spaynel* in five of Chaucer, Group D, 267.

Evidence for the synizetic pronunciation of the *i* here treated, we have only found for the words *collier*, *ier*, and *soldier*, and for cases in which the letter are preceded by an *s*-sound.

Jones mentions the sound of *she* for written *cie* in "*ancient, deficient, etc.*"

The sound of *she* for written *scie* in "*conscience, omniscience, etc.*"

The sound of *she* for written *sie* in "*brasier, glasier, hosier, osier, transient.*"

The sound of *she* for written *tie* in "*patience, patient, quotient, etc.*"

We gather from Ellis's Pronouncing Vocabulary of the XVII. century, that in 1688 Guy Miego registers synizetic pronunciation for *ancient, crosier, hosier, osier, soldier, and transient*; that in 1685 Cooper mentions this pronunciation in *ancient, collier, courtier, ti- ante vocalem, and transient*; and that Price gives this pronunciation for *soldier* as early as 1668.

The only evidence we have found for this synizetic pronunciation in Shakespeare's time is the spelling *anchentry* in *Ado* II, 1, 80, Q. & F., and the same spelling occurs repeatedly in Warner, from whose work we cite the two examples following:

The second Richard ouerkind to Parasits, and foe  
to aunchant Cronets, feweld all might fier to Englands woe.

W. Warner, *Albions England*, 1612, p. 338.

An Aunchanter than I hath had) by sweet Saint Pancrace, no,  
*Id. ibid.* p. 363.

### III. 3. ii.

Sh. *full*: Nervii *once*.

Sh. *short*: Bentivolii *once* (?).

### III. 4. io.

M. *full*: Antiochus *once*; champion *once* in S.A. 705 (?);  
contagion *once* in Mask (Comus) 467; Ethio-  
pian *once*; legion *once* in Mask 603; oblivion  
*once* in Ps. 88, 52; period *once* in Mask 585;  
union *once* in Christ's Nat. 108; and of words

ending in *-sion*, *-tion*, or *-xion*, the following cases: apparition *once* in Mask 641; condition *once* in Mask 685; complexion *once* in Mask 749; contemplation *twice* in II Pens. 54, and Mask 377; Jonian *once*; proportion *once* in Mask 773; selfdelusion *once* in Mask 365; session *once* in Christ's Nat. 163; superscription *once* in Univ. Car. II, 34; suspicion *once* in Mask 413; vision *twice* in Mask 298 & 457.

**M. short:** Antioch *once*; Arioeh *once*; battalion *twice*; bullion *once*; champion 7 or 6 *t.*; chariot 23 *t.*; charioteer *twice*; clarion *twice*; contagion 3 *t.*, *e. g.* P.L. V, 877; communion *twice*; companion 5 *t.*; curiosity *once*; dominion 17 *t.*; Deucalion *once*; Ethiop 3 *t.*; exterior *once*; idiot *once*; inferior 14 *t.*; legion 18 *t.*, *e. g.* P.L. I, 301; Libecchio *once*; million 10 *t.*; oblivion *twice*, *e. g.* P.L. II, 583; opinion 4 *t.*; pavillion 4 *t.*; period *twice*, *e. g.* P.L. XII, 467; quaternion *once*; rebellion 8 *t.*; region 26 *t.*; religion 8 *t.*; Scipio *twice*; scorpion 5 *t.*; septentrion *once*; Serralliona *once*; superior 15 *t.*; union 8 *t.*, *e. g.* P.L. VII, 161; warrior 12 *t.*; and all words in *-sion*, *-tion*, and *-xion* with the exception of those mentioned higher up.

**Sh. full:** Antioch 4 *t.*, *e. g.* Per. I, 2, 70; Antonio 19 *t.*, *e. g.* Shrew I, 2, 54; Bellario 3 *t.*, *e. g.* M. of V. IV, 1, 105; Benvolio *once* in R. & J. III, 1, 110; Biondello 3 *t.*; Cambio *once* in Shrew V, 1, 125; Cassio 3 *t.* in O. I, 1, 20, II, 1, 26, III, 4, 32; Cesario *twice* in Tw.N. I, 4, 12, IV, 1, 54; champion 4 *t.* in R 2. I, 3, 7, III H 6. IV, 7, 68, V, 7, 6, T.A. I, 1, 65;

chariot *once* in Per. II, 4, 7; Claudio 12 *t.*, *e. g.* Ado I, 1, 324; companion 4 *t.* in M. of V. III, 4, 11, II H 4. IV, 4, 68, R 2. V, 3, 7, Per. I, 1, 18; contagion *once* in Errors II, 2, 146; cullion *once* in Shrew IV, 2, 20; Dionyza 5 *t.*; dominion *twice* in John III, 1, 154, R 2. I, 3, 142; Dromio 5 *t.*, *e. g.* Errors III, 1, 43; Endymion *once*; Ethiop *twice* in Gent. II, 2, 26, Ado V, 4, 38; fashion *once* in J. C. IV, 3, 135; Gremio 5 *t.*, *e. g.* Shrew II, 1, 17; Grumio 4 *t.*, *e. g.* Shrew I, 2, 35; Hortensio 6 *t.*, *e. g.* Shrew I, 2, 36; Hyperion *once* in T. & C. II, 3, 207; inferior *once* in Shrew Ind. 2, 69; Ionia *once*; Ionian *once*; legion *once* in J. C. IV, 3, 76; Licio 3 *t.*, *e. g.* Shrew III, 1, 56; Lucentio 10 *t.*, *e. g.* Shrew I, 1, 221; Lucio *once* in M. for M. V, 1, 73; Mercatio *once*; Mercutio 3 *t.*, *e. g.* R. & J. III, 1, 142; million 4 *t.* in Shrew III, 2, 241, H 5. Prol. 16, T.A. II, 1, 49, A. & C. I, 2, 39; minion *twice* in Gent. I, 2, 88 (?), John II, 1, 392; oblivion 3 *t.* in T.A. III, 1, 296, T. & C. III, 3, 146, IV, 5, 167; opinion 5 *t.* in M. of V. I, 1, 102, III, 5, 76, I H 4. V, 4, 48, I H 6. I, 4, 64, J. C. II, 1, 145; pavilion *once* in H 5. IV, I, 27; period *once* in II H 4. IV, 5, 231; Petruchio 5 *t.*, *e. g.* Shrew II, 1, 71; physiognomy *once*; Pisanio 3 *t.*, *e. g.* Cym. I, 6, 139; priority *twice*; rebellion 5 *t.* in John V, 4, 11, I H 4. V, 1, 74, II H 4. Ind. 26, III H 6. I, 1, 133, Cor. III, 1, 167; region 3 *t.* in T.A. IV, 3, 13, J.C. V, 1, 3,

Per. IV, 4, 4; religion 3*t.* in John III, 1, 280, II H 4. I, 1, 201, I H 6. 1, 3, 65; signior (senior) *twice* in Shrew III, 2, 151, O. I, 3, 76 (perhaps more, for we have not examined all the cases); septentrion *once*; Thurio *once* in Gent. V, 2, 31; Tiberio *once*; Tranio 4*t.*, *e. g.* Shrew I, 1, 248; Vincentio 11 *t.*, *e. g.* Shrew I, 1, 13; warrior 4*t.* in H 5. III, 5, 31, I H 6. III, 3, 22, T.A. I, 1, 25, O. II, 1, 184.

Sh. *short*: Antioch 5*t.*, *e. g.* Per. I, 3, 19; Antonio 30*t.*, *e. g.* Tp. I, 2, 66; Bassanio 36 *t.*, *e. g.* M. of V. I, 1, 57; battalion *once*; Bellario 6 *t.*, *e. g.* M. of V. III, 4, 50; Benvolio 3 *t.*, *e. g.* R. & J. III, 1, 156; Biondello (?); Brabantio 4*t.*; Caesarion *twice*; Cambio 3*t.*, *e. g.* Shrew IV, 4, 109; capriccio *once*; carrion 12*t.*; Cassio 90*t.*, *e. g.* O. I, 3, 398; Cesario 11 *t.*, *e. g.* Tw.N. II, 4, 2; champion 12*t.*, *e. g.* Venus 596; chariot 12*t.*, *e. g.* Venus 1192; Claudio 35 *t.*, *e. g.* Ado I, 1, 298; companion 31 *t.*, *e. g.* Lucr. 1066; companionship *twice*; contagion 5 *t.*, *e. g.* Cor. I, 4, 30; coragio *twice*; cullion (?); curiosity *twice*; cushion 9 *t.*; Deucalion *once*; dominion 3 *t.*, *e. g.* W.T. II, 3, 177; Dromio 22 *t.*, *e. g.* Errors I, 2, 10; Ethiop 6 *t.*, *e. g.* L.L.L. IV, 3, 118; exterior 4 *t.*; exteriorly *once*; falchion 7*t.*; fashion 76 *t.*, *e. g.* Lucr. 1319; Gremio 10 *t.*, *e. g.* Shrew II, 1, 46; Grumio 6 *t.*, *e. g.* Shrew I, 2, 47; Horatio 20 *t.*; Hortensio 21 *t.*, *e. g.* Shrew I, 1, 56; Hyperion 5 *t.*, *e. g.* H 5. IV, 1, 292; idiot 9 *t.*; Ilion 6 *t.*; inferior 8 *t.*, *e. g.* Sonn. 80, 7; interior *twice*; legion 20 *t.*, *e. g.* --

Sonn. 154, 6; Licio 3 *t.*, *e. g.* Shrew II, 1, 60; Lucentio 19 *t.*, *e. g.* Shrew I, 1, 223; Lucio *once* in M. for M. I, 2, 181; Malvolio 9 *t.*; Mercutio 13 *t.*, *e. g.* R. & J. III, 1, 127; million 11 *t.*, *e. g.* Sonn. 115, 5; minion 19 *t.*, *e. g.* Sonn. 126, 9; nuncio *once*; oblivion 12 *t.*, *e. g.* Venus 557; onion 3 *t.*; opinion 64 *t.*, *e. g.* Lucr. 937; pavilion 4 *t.*, *e. g.* T. & C. Prol. 15; Pelion *once*; period 14 *t.*, *e. g.* Lucr. 380; Petruchio 23 *t.*, *e. g.* Shrew II, 1, 182; Philario *once*; pinion 4 *t.*; Pisanio 19 *t.*, *e. g.* Cym. I, 6, 155; rebellion 20 *t.*, *e. g.* John III, 1, 289; region 20 *t.*, *e. g.* Sonn. 33, 12; religion 11 *t.*, *e. g.* Compl. 250; Salerio 5 *t.*; scorpion 3 *t.*; senior *or* signior *many times*; seniory *once*; superior *twice*; Thurio 19 *t.*, *e. g.* Gent. II, 3, 84; Tranio 19 *t.*, *e. g.* Shrew I, 1, 1; union 6 *t.*; vermilion *once*; Vincentio *once* in Shrew I, 1, 200; warrior 25 *t.*, *e. g.* Sonn. 25, 9.

We have not separately examined every one of the words in *-sion*, *-tion*, and *-xion* in Shakespeare. As a rule, these endings constitute two syllables, only at the end of a verse, but in this position pretty frequently. To this rule there are, however, a few exceptions, and Sidney Walker is undoubtedly right, for instance, in reading the first three lines of Cor. I, 10, as follows:

*Auf.* The town is ta'en!  
*First Sol.* 'Twill be deliver'd back  
 On good condition.  
*Auf.* Condition!

In L.L.L. V, 1, 110, Q. *mustachio* is found in the spelling *mustachie*, and, strictly speaking, this is the only —

and after all not very weighty — direct evidence we have found for the apocopic “short” pronunciation of the *-io* ending in Shakespeare’s time. On the other hand, we have also found:

And if the one hath a Fancy to stars<sup>1)</sup> his mustachos,  
the other hath . . . . .

*James Howell*, Instructions, etc. (Repr. Arb. p. 31).

Of indirect evidence we have found just a little more. In the Folio of Shakespeare the name of the Roman triumvir is repeatedly spelt *Antonio*, while, besides, it is well known that in Shakespeare’s time an *o* was often arbitrarily affixed to English names, and in plays these longer and more orotund forms were made to alternate with the shorter forms without *o*. In the dearth of further data we must provisionally leave the true “short” pronunciation in this case a moot point. In 1701 Jones registers the pronunciation *nunsho* for *nuncio*.

Monosyllabic pronunciation of *-io-* as “e”, at the same time with optional pronunciation of each of its letters separately, is by Jones recorded on p. 45 for the following words, “*carrion, chariot, clarion, contagion, cushion, fashion, luncheon, Marriot, murrion, nunchion, onion, opinion, punchion, religion, union, etc.*”

The following rhymes presuppose syncopic pronunciation (dropping of *i* in the *-ion* ending):

To get on them a Race of Champions,  
Of which old Homer first made Lampoons.

*Hudibras*, I Part, 1663, p. 88.

And bore aloft before the Champion  
A Petticoat displaid, and Rampant;

*Id.* II Part, 1664, p. 113.

---

<sup>1)</sup> stars = starch.

The former rides in Triumph for it;  
The later in a two-wheel'd Chariot,  
Hudibras, I Part, 1663, p. 97.

When o're the Breeches greedy Women  
Fight, to extend their vast Dominion,  
Id. II Part, 1664, p. 117.

Madam (quoth he) your Love's a Million,  
To do is less, than to be willing,  
Id. III Part, 1678, p. 31.

Provided that they pass th' Opinion,  
Of Able Juries of old Women:  
Id. id. p. 30.

And Nastier, in an Old Opinion,  
Then those, who never shift their Linnen.  
Id. id. p. 168.

This Crisis then I'll set my rest on,  
And put her boldly to the Question.  
Id. II Part, 1664, p. 22.

But left at large to make their best on,  
Without being call'd to account, or question.  
Id. III Part, 1678, p. 129.

It is no Scandal, nor Asperion,  
Upon a Great, and noble Person  
Id. id. p. 243.

Had not on Honorable Conditions,  
Releas't 'em from the worst of Prisons,  
Id. id. p. 264.

Which thou hast now no way to lessen,  
But by an open, free Confession,  
Id. id. p. 68.

Or bring my Action of Conversion  
And Trover for my Goods? Ah Whorson.  
Id. id. p. 232.

And while he gave himself Diversion,  
T'accommodate his Beast and Person,  
Id. id. p. 198.

They did not mean, He wrought th' effusion,  
In Person, like Sir Pride, and Hughson:  
Id. id. p. 165.

Who taught them all their Sprinkling Lessons,  
Their Tones and sanctif'd expressions,  
Id. id. p. 130.

While the proud remnant of those scattered Masons  
Had falsed it in hundred thousand fashions,

*J. Sylrester*, Folio 1621, p. 261.

As one cut out to pass your tricks on,  
With Fulhams of Poetique ficksion :

*Hudibras*, II Part, 1664, p. 46.

(The Formal Livery, and Seasin,  
That puts a Lover in Possession)

*Id.* III Part. 1678, p. 56.

Or by their Controversies, lessen  
The dignity of their Profession.

*Id.* *id.* p. 220.

Which having done, the Wizard steps in,  
To give him suitable Reception ;

*Id.* II Part. 1664, p. 168.

Great Actions are not always true sons  
Of great and mighty Resolutions :

*Id.* I Part, 1663, p. 67.

Before so meriting a Person  
Could get a Grant, but in Reversion :

*Id.* III Part, 1678, p. 22.

And make him glad to read his Lesson,  
Or take a turn for't at the Session :

*Id.* II Part, 1664, p. 215.

Syncopation of *i* in this case we have found symbolised by the mode of printing in the cases following: battailon R 3. V, 3, 11, Q<sub>2</sub> & Q<sub>4</sub>; chop(p)ine Ham. II, 2, 447, Q. & F.; mansonry Mac. I, 6, 5, F.; misprison L.L.L. IV, 3, 98 Q.; Pellon Ham. V, 1, 276, Q.S.; signorie R 3. IV, 4, 36, Q. (signeurie F.);

Yf by none of these meanes the matter goo forward, as they  
woulde haue it, then they procure occaysons of debate,

*Thomas More*, *Utopia* translated (Repr. Arber, p. 135).

. . . ., he wyll not onelye doo no manfull and hardy acte  
hym selfe, but also be occayson of cowardenes to his fellowes.

*Id.* *ibid.* p. 138.

Who D'oge? my D'ogenes? a great Writer, marry!

*Ben Jonson*, Second F., Tub, p. 72.

Him often questoned this King of Us, and Europs strength,  
*W. Warner*, *Albions England*, 1597, p. 285.

Yea, are not of Commissions themselves some that sometimes  
Doe borrow of their Justiceship for Cæsar-dues and Crimes?

Id. *ibid.*, 1612, p. 404.

A Phisonomie, effigies, ei, hæc.

*P. Levins*, Manipulus Vocabulorum 1570 (Repr. E.E.T.S. col. 101).

Finally wheras the declension, gender or coniugation is sometimes hard to know,

Id. *ibid.* (Repr. E.E.T.S., Preface p. 5).

Not he, by Sonnets passionate, did give the world to wit

W. Warner, Albions England, 1612, p. 376.

Intrusive *i* we have found in *cosioner* (= *cozener*) Lear, 6, 167, Q. We have seen that Jones cites *marriot* = *marrot*, a popular name for the Great Auk, *Alca immutabilis*, and *murrion* (= *murrain*), which we also find printed M.N.D. II, 1, 97 (Q. & F.).

In various words this intrusive *i* has kept its ground in modern usage: *cullion*, and *pumpion* or *pompion* had no original *i*. Gower uses *stalon* (O. Fr. *estalon*) for the modern *stallion*; the word is spelt *stallant* in Levins, with a crescent *t*, and *stalland* in Jehan Palsgrave. In Chaucer we find *careyne* (= O. Fr. *caroigne*) for the modern *carrion*, and in Shakespeare, too, this word is repeatedly spelt as a trisyllable in various ways (*carrayne*, *carren*, etc.). Chaucer rather uses *fasoun* (= O. Fr. *facheon*, *fazon*, *fachon*) for the modern *fashion*, and *oyouns* (= Fr. *oignon*) for modern *onions*.

On the other hand, the trisyllabic *merlion* (Falco æsalon) used by Chaucer, has now become *merlin*.

The French proper names *Chatillon* and *Rousillon* are always spelt with the ending *-ion* in the First Folio of Shakespeare's works: the first word is actually quadrisyllabic in John I, 1, 30, and the second in A.W. V, 1, 28.

Of great weight, as absolute evidence of the syncopation of the *i*, is the statement made in 1643 by Richard

Hodges, "a School-Master" (see Ellis, pp. 1018—1020), that the following words are "alike in sound and unlike both in their signification and writing":

*champion*, the *champain* field. (Also mentioned by O. Price in 1668.)

*murrain*, *murion* a head-piece.

*millions*, musk-melons. (Also mentioned by C. Cooper in 1685.)

And in this way it also becomes clear how the *farcins* in Shrew III, 2, 53 can have got into print as the *fashions*.

Evidence for the synizetic pronunciation cannot be traced farther back than 1685.

Jones has the following:

The sound of *shi* written *chio* in the words "*lunchion*, *nunchion*, *punchion*"; the sound *sho* written *shio* in the words "*cushion*, *fashion*, *lushious*, *parishioner*"; the sound *sho* written *sio* in the words "*aversion*, *conversion*, *evasion*, etc."; the sound *sho* written *tio* "In all words not directed to be written otherwise", etc.

In 1688 Miede gives the synizetic pronunciation for *action* and *pension*; and in 1685 Cooper does the same for *bullion*, *companion*, *inhesion*, "*ti-* ante vocalem", and *provision*; all this on the testimony of Ellis's Pronouncing Vocabulary of the XVII. century.

### III. 5. iou.

M. *full*: contrarious *once* in S. A. 669 (?); glorious *once* in S. A. 1660 (?); odious *once* in Ps. LXXXVIII, 34; various *once* in S. A. 668 (?); victorious *once* in S. A. 1663 (?).

M. *short*: abstemious *once*; ambitious 7 *t.*; anxious *twice*; audacious *twice*; calumnious *once*; capacious *twice*; cautious *twice*; cautiously *once*; com-

modiously *once*; conscious 4 *t.*; contagious *once*; copious 4 *t.*; curious 5 *t.*; delicious 12 *t.*; deliciously *once*; devious *once*; dubious *twice*; efficacious *once*; envious 5 *t.*; factious *twice*; fallacious 5 *t.*; felonious *once*; furious 8 *t.*; glorious 51 or 52 *t.*; gloriously 5 *t.*; gracious 9 *t.*; graciously *twice*; harmonious 5 *t.*; ignominious *twice*; illustrious 8 *t.*; imperious *twice*; impervious *once*; impious 9 *t.*; impiously *twice*; industrious 5 *t.*; inglorious 8 *t.*; injurious *once*; irreligious *once*; judicious *twice*; laborious 4 *t.*; lascivious 3 *t.*; loquacious *once*; lushious *once*; luxurious 5 *t.*; malicious *twice*; melodious 8 *t.*; meritorious *once*; mysterious 7 *t.*, mysteriously *once*; notorious *once*; noxious 5 *t.*, oblivious *once*; obnoxious 3 *t.*; obsequious 3 *t.*; obvious 6 *t.*; odious 6 *t.*, *e. g.* P.L. VI, 408; odiously *twice*; officious 3 *t.*; opprobrious 3 *t.*; parsimonious *once*; penurious *once*; perfidious 3 *t.*; pernicious 5 *t.*; precious 11 *t.*; prodigious 6 *t.*; propitious 5 *t.*; rapacious *once*; rebellious 9 *t.*; religious 4 *t.*; robustious *once*; sacrilegious *twice*; sagacious *once*; saviour 25 *t.*; seditious *once*; sententious *once*; serious *twice*; spacious 13 *t.*; specious 5 *t.*; spurious *once*; studious 6 *t.*; stupendious *twice*; superstitious *once*; suspicious 5 *t.*; symphonious *once*; tedious 7 *t.*; unharmonious *once*; unobnoxious *once*; unsuspicious *once*; uxorious *twice*; various 34 or 35 *t.*; variously *once*; vicious *once*; victorious 10 or 11 *t.*

Sh. *full*: abstemious *once*; ambitious 5 *t.* in J.C. III, 2, 83 & 91 & 95 & 98 & 103; curious *twice* in

Shrew IV, 4, 36, Per. I, 4, 43; envious *once* in R. & J. II, 2, 7; glorious *once* in H 5. II, 2, 183; gracious *4t.* in Ado IV, 1, 109, I H 6. I, 4, 85, R 3. IV, 4, 204, and Sonn. 135, 7; licentious *once* in Errors II, 2, 133; malicious *once* in Cor. I, 1, 91; meritorious *once* in II H 6. III, 1, 270; odious *once* in H 8. III, 2, 331; perfidious *once* in H 8. I, 2, 156; pernicious *twice* in II H 6. II, 1, 21 and H 8. V, 3, 19; precious *once* in I H 6. I, 6, 24; prodigious *once* in John III, 1, 46; religious *3t.* in H 5. II, 2, 130, I H 6. III, 1, 54 and T.A. V, 1, 74; serious *once* in H 8. III, 2, 135; spacious *twice* in T.A. II, 1, 114, and Sonn. 135, 5; tedious *4t.* in R 2. V, 2, 26, I H 6. IV, 7, 74, III H 6. III, 1, 9, and R 3. I, 4, 91<sup>1)</sup>).

Sh. *short*: adoptious *once*; ambitious 27 *t.*, *e. g.* Lucr. 150; ambitiously *twice*; audacious 6 *t.*; audaciously *twice*; auspicious 7 *t.*; avaricious *once*; behaviour 29 *t.*; calumnious *twice*; captious (capacious) *once*; ceremonious 5 *t.*; ceremoniously *once*; combustious *once*; compunctious *once*; conceptionous *once*; contagious 8 *t.*; contentious *twice*; contrarious *twice*; contrariously *once*; contumelious 3 *t.*; contumeliously *once*; copious *twice*; curious 12 *t.*, *e. g.* Sonn. 38, 13; deceptious *once*; delicious 4 *t.*; deliciousness *once*; disgracious *twice*; dissentious 5 *t.*; egregious 3 *t.*; egregiously *once*; envious 32 *t.*, *e. g.* Venus 705; enviously *once*; expeditious *once*; factious 10 *t.*;

---

<sup>1)</sup> See W.Sh.: Pros. & Text, p. 353, l. 88.

felonious *once*; furious 12 *t.*; glorious 44 *t.*, *e. g.* Lucr. 109; gloriously *twice*; gracious 170 *t.*, *e. g.* Sonn. 10, 11; graciously 5 *t.*; harmonious *twice*; ignominious *twice*; illustrious 3 *t.*; imperious 14 *t.*; imperiously *once*; impious 9 *t.*; inauspicious *once*; industrious 4 *t.*; industriously *once*; infectious 7 *t.*; infectionously *once*; ingenious 3 *t.*; ingeniously *once*; inglorious *once*; injurious 17 *t.*; irreligious 3 *t.*; judicious 3 *t.*; lascivious 11 *t.*; licentious 3 *t.*, *e. g.* H 5. III, 3, 22; litigious *once*; luxurious 4 *t.*; luxuriously *once*; malicious 10 *t.*, *e. g.* John II, 1, 314; maliciously *twice*; melodious 9 *t.*; meritorious *twice*, *e. g.* Lucr. 1692; notorious 11 *t.*; notoriously *once*; oblivious *twice*; obsequious 7 *t.*; obsequiously *once*; odious 8 *t.*, *e. g.* Tp. III, 1, 5; officious 5 *t.*; opprobriously *once*; penurious *once*; perfidious *twice*, *e. g.* Tp. I, 2, 68; perfidiously *once*; pernicious 17 *t.*, *e. g.* Ham. I, 5, 105; perniciously *once*; precious 73 *t.*, *e. g.* Venus 824; preciously *once*; prodigious 4 *t.*, *e. g.* R 3. I, 2, 22; prodigiously *once*; proluxious *once*; rebellious 10 *t.*; religious 16 *t.*, *e. g.* Compl. 250; religiously 5 *t.*; rubious *once*; sacrilegious *twice*; sanctimonious *once*; Saviour *once*; seditious *twice*; serious 19 *t.*, *e. g.* Tp. II, 1, 219; seriously 4 *t.*; spacious 9 *t.*, *e. g.* R 3. I, 2, 246; studious *twice*; studiously *once*; superstitious 4 *t.*; superstitiously *twice*; suspicious 5 *t.*; tedious 36 *t.*, *e. g.* Venus 841; tediously *twice*; tediousness 3 *t.*; unauspicious *once*; ungracious 7 *t.*; vicious 9 *t.*; viciousness *once*; victorious 15 *t.*

The syncopation — and conversely the additional syllabic force — of the *i* is expressly mentioned by Jones. On p. 45 he says that the sound of *e* is written *iou*, "When it may be sounded *iou*, as in all that end in the sound of *sious*". On p. 53, that the sound of *es* is written *ious*, "When it may be sounded *ious*, as in *contagious*, *gracious*, etc. sounded sometimes *contages*, *grashes*, etc." On p. 87, that the sound of *ou* is written *iou*, "In all that may be sounded *iou*, etc. as *gracious*, *spurious*, etc." On p. 110, that the sound of *ur* is written *viour*, "When it may be sounded *viour*, as in *behaviour*, *Saviour* etc." On p. 117, that the sound of *us* is written *ious*, "When it may be sounded *ious*."

The following rhymes presuppose syncopic pronunciation :

For I confess, if that might merit favour,

Here I display my lewd and loose behaviour

*Marlowe*, Ovid's Eleg. II, 4; 3 & 4 (Ed. Bullen).

The ancient Hero's were illustrious

For b'ing benigne<sup>1</sup>), and not blustrous,

Hudibras, I Part, 1663, p. 229.

And still appear the more Industrious

The more your Projects, are Prepostrous

Hudibras, III Part, 1678, p. 284.

For loe, a damsell came, though meanely clad,

In shepheards weeds, yet fresh and faire of fauour

And such a one as in those base clothes had,

A shew of princely birth and hie behaiour,

She finding him lie there in case so bad,

Thought it were charitie to be his sauour :

This was (if you forget) the Ladie faire,

That of Cataya was vndoubted haire.

*J. Harington*, Orlando Fur. 1591. XIX, 12.

We next cite the following syncopic spellings: in-  
gen(n)ous L.L.L. IV, 2, 80 Q. & F.;

Béhaouore, gestus, us, hic.

*P. Lerins*, Manipulus Vocab. 1570 (Repr. E.E.T.S. col. 222).

---

<sup>1</sup>) According to Jones, p. 57, an optional trisyllabic pronunciation of *benigne* is *benigun*. This does not apply to Shakespeare's time, when the *g* in this word was silent.

And miserable Papists, too deliriously mislead,

*W. Warner*, Albions England, 1612, p. 382.

All tools that enginous despair could frame

*G. Chapman*, Hero & Leander, III, 312 (Ed. Bullen).

Her princely presence, and her stately havour.

*J. Harington*. Orlando Fur. I, 53, 8.

. . . hit wulde be ouer teduse and weriful to the redder  
therof.

The Revelation to the Monk of Evesham, 1482 (Repr. Arb. p. 82).

. . . and vnto the tedusnes of some stondyng by he thankyd  
our lord and redemer . . . .

Id. id. p. 25.

. . . the grete stenche and tormentys that was there smytte  
me wyth full grete horroure and tedusnes.

Id. id. p. 59.

Therefore while thys onhappy sowle by the vycторыse (= vic-  
torious) pompy of her eumyes was goyng to be broughte  
into helle . . . .

Id. id. p. 43.

Intrusive *i* in this case we have found, for example, in  
*dexteriously* Tw. N. I, 5, 66, F<sub>1,2,3</sub>; *facinerious* (= faci-  
norous) A. W. II, 3, 35 F.; *jealous* is very often spelt with  
intrusive *i* in the First Folio of Shakespeare; *illustrious*  
(= not lustrous) Cym. I, 6, 109.

Milton uses the word *stupendous* twice, and in both cases  
Beeching's reprint of the *editio princeps* shows the spelling  
*stupendious*. That this intrusive *i* might be actually pro-  
nounced, and in metre might count as a syllable by itself, is  
proved, for example, by

My dukedoms name, if he be iealous,

*Th. Heywood*, Edward IV. (Repr. Pearson, Vol. I, p. 132.)

The intrusive *i*, as a rule consonantised, is exceedingly  
common before such endings as *-ous*, *-our*, *-ance* in the vulgar  
speech even of our day; *e. g.* in *grievous*, *tremendous*;

. . . . and werry proud they is of their *apperience*.

*Punch*, Sept. 29, 1894, p. 145<sup>b</sup> [Robert, the City Waiter].

*Storm*, Englische Philologe<sup>2</sup>, pp. 818, 819, cites from

Dickens and other authors such vulgar forms as *faviour*, *flaviour*, *defendiour*, *preserviour*, *lovier*, *barbareous*, *momentious*, *mischievious*, *narvious* (= nervous), *heinious*, *galliant*, *parient*. In Dickens's *Chuzzlewit* Mrs. Gamp uses *aperiently* for "apparently", no doubt because she was professionally familiar with the application of aperient medicines. *Dean Alford*, *The Queen's English*, p. 63 (1864), says: "Two other words occur to me which are very commonly mangled by our clergy. One of these is *covetous*, and its substantive *covetousness*. I hope that some of my clerical readers will be induced to leave off pronouncing them *covetious* and *covetousness*".

In Middle English we find *enginous* in Gower, and *laborous* in Chaucer.

As respects the evidence for the synizetic pronunciation, Jones tells us that the sound *sho* is written *cio* "in *gracious*, *malicious*, *spacious*, *audacious*, *nuncio*, *pernicious*, etc."; and that the sound *sho* is written *scio* "in *conscious*".

The earliest testimony concerning the synizetic pronunciation is, according to Ellis, Cooper's statement in 1688 respecting the words *cautious* and *gracious*. This testimony refers only to words in which *iou* is preceded by an *s*-sound. But Cooper also registers among the "*Voces quæ affiner habent sonum sed diversum sensum et scripturam*":

*serious* serius, *serous* serosus.

Owen Price (Ellis, p. 1027) also mentions *Saviour* and *savour* among the words "of like sound".

### III. 6. *iu*.

*M. full*: diurnal 5*t.*; Ophiucus *once*; triúmph 4*t.* (and 3*t.* where it may also be triúmph); triumphal 5*t.*; triumphant 6*t.*; triumphing 3*t.*

*M. short*: Casius *once*; Curius *once*; Danubius *once*; Ely-

sium *twice*; Fabricius *once*; Favonius *once*; Genius *3 t.*; Ilium *once*; Julius *once*; Mincius *once*; Ophiusa *once*; opium *once*; Pandemonium *twice*; Quintius *once*; Tiberius *once*.

Sh. *full*: Actium *once*; Aufidius *twice* in Cor. I, 2, 1 & 6, 54; Brundusium *once*; Byzantium *once*; Canidius *once* in A. & C. III, 7, 58; Cassius *11 t.*, *e. g.* J.C. I, 2, 36; Celius *once*; Cominius *twice* in Cor. IV, 1, 19 & 34; Demetrius *20 t.*, *e. g.* M.N.D. I, 1, 24; diurnal *once*; Elysium *4 t.*, *e. g.* Gent. II, 7, 38; genius *once* in T. & C. IV, 4, 52, Q.; Ligarius *once* in J.C. II, 2, 111; Lucilius *5 t.*, *e. g.* Tim. I, 1, 111; Lucius *8 t.*, *e. g.* Tim. III, 4, 2; Marcius *3 t.*, *e. g.* Cor. I, 1, 237; Mutius *once* in T.A. I, 1, 389; Octavius *once* in A. & C. III, 7, 73; Publius *5 t.*, *e. g.* J.C. II, 2, 108; Silvius *twice* in As III, 5, 845 & 13; Telamonius *once*; triumphant *13 t.*; triumphantly *3 t.*; triumphing *4 t.*; triumphs *twice*; triumvirate *once*; Ventidius *twice*, *e. g.* Tim. III, 3, 3; Virginius *once* in T.A. V, 3, 36; Volumnius *twice* in J.C. V, 5, 16 & 21.

Sh. *short*: Æmilius *twice*; Antium *5 t.*; Antonius *twice*; Ascanius *once*; Aufidius *25 t.*, *e. g.* Cor. I, 1, 233; Aufidiuses *once*; Belarius *4 t.*; Canidius *once* in A. & C. III, 7, 21; Capucius *once*; Cassius *61 t.*, *e. g.* J.C. I, 2, 63; Claudius (Claudio in Folio) *twice*; Clotharius *once*; Colatium *twice*; Cominius *15 t.*, *e. g.* Cor. I, 1, 241; Cornelius *twice*; Decius *7 t.*; Demetrius *26 t.*, *e. g.* M.N.D. I, 1, 52; Domitius *twice*; Elysium *3 t.*, *e. g.* Venus 600; Flavius *3 t.*; Florentius

*once*; *genius* 4*t.*, *e. g.* *TP.* IV, 1, 27; *Guiderius* 3*t.*; *Hirtius* *once*; *Hortensius* *once*; *Hostilius* *twice*; *Ilium* *twice*; *Julius* 14*t.*; *Junius* *twice*; *Lartius* 6*t.*; *Ligarius* 4*t.*, *e. g.* *J.C.* II, 1, 215; *Lucilius* 5*t.*, *e. g.* *J.C.* IV, 2, 19; *Lucius* 60*t.*, *e. g.* *Tim.* III, 3, 2; *Lucretius* *twice*; *Mamil-  
lius* *twice*; *Marcus* 55*t.*, *e. g.* *Cor.* I, 1, 167; *Menenius* 5*t.*; *Mulmutius* *once*; *Mutius* 6*t.*, *e. g.* *T.A.* I, 1, 348; *Octavius* 20*t.*, *e. g.* *J.C.* III, 1, 289; *Polonius* 3*t.*; *Popilius* *twice*; *Publius* 13*t.*, *e. g.* *Cor.* II, 3, 249; *Roscius* *once*; *Sempronius* *twice*; *Sicilius* *twice*; *Silius* 3*t.*; *Silvius* 5*t.*, *e. g.* *A. & C.* II, 1, 18; *Sossius* *once*; *Statilius* *once*; *Tenantius* *twice*; *Titinius* 18*t.*; *Trebonius* 6*t.*; *Valerius* *once*; *Varrius* 3*t.*; *Ventidius* 6*t.*, *e. g.* *Tim.* I, 2, 9; *Virginus* *once* in *T.A.* V, 3, 50; *Volumnius* 4*t.*, *e. g.* *J.C.* V, 5, 15.

There can be no doubt that in Shakespeare's time and even long before him, the short pronunciation of the above words was brought about by dropping either *-us* or *-ius*, these curtailed forms being of course traceable to French. For a discussion of this point we must refer the reader to *W. Sh.: Prosody and Text*, pp. 114—117<sup>1)</sup>.

We also consider it as beyond doubt that the endings *-us* and *-ius* were often, by way of quasi-correction, affixed by printers or editors to proper names in the works of Shakespeare. Not only do the requirements of the metre

<sup>1)</sup> To the evidence there given we would add the following from Ben Jonson's *Conversations with William Drummond of Hawthornden*: "A translatour of the Emperours lyves, translated Antonius Pius, Antonie Pye" [*The Works of Ben Jonson*, ed. Francis Cunningham (1897), III, p. 490].

necessitate this conclusion, but the frequent cases of confusion between *Antonio* and *Antonius*, *Claudio* and *Claudius*, *Flavio* and *Flavius* also point that way.

Synizetic pronunciation in this case we first find recorded by Jones in 1701, but his statements exclusively refer to cases in which *-ius* is preceded by an *s*-sound, including, naturally enough, the word *Sergius*.

As regards Milton, reserving such words as have *-ius* preceded by an *s*-sound for subsequent discussion, we surmise that in his "short" pronunciation he syncopated the *i*, pronouncing *Danub'us*, *Gen'us*, etc. According to Ellis, Vol. V, p. 720, Dr. Murray registers the syncopic pronunciation of the word *genius* as *genus* as still extant in the dialect of the Southern Lowlands of Scotland, and in 1817 the same pronunciation is referred to in "Errors of Pronunciation and Improper Expressions used frequently and chiefly by the inhabitants of London" (Ellis, Vol. V, pp. 227 & 228). In *Goldsmith's* *She Stoops to Conquer*, Tony Lumpkin sings:

Good liquor, I stoutly maintain,  
Gives genus a better discerning.

And *Storm*, Engl. Phil.<sup>2</sup>, p. 819, cites the same form from Thackeray and from *Dickens's* *Oliver Twist*. As a rule, vulgarisms of this kind are mere survivals from an earlier stage of the spoken language of educated people, and as such are well worth close study.

We have not, however, found any direct evidence to prove the syncopic pronunciation with suppression of the *i*, and if we put the question whether such syncopic pronunciation was in use already in Shakespeare's time, the only indications pointing that way which we have come across, are the spellings *Lucus* J.C. IV, 3, 296, F.; *Marcus* Cor. I, 9, 65 & 67, F.; and *Octavus* J.C. III, 2, 276, F.

## IV. 1. oa.

*M. full*: Choaspes *once*; Mánoah *once* in S.A. 328.

*M. short*: Mánoah 3 *t.*, e. g. S.A. 1441; Siloa *once*.

*Sh. full*: coact *once*; coactive *once*; Genoa *once*.

The "short" pronunciation is *Mano* and *Silo*, for on p. 81 Jones gives the sound *o* for written *oa* in the words "Ahanoam, Boanerges, Gilboa, Jeroboam, mecoacum, Zoan, Zoar"; and Owen Price (1668) (see Ellis, p. 1028) registers the following trio among the words of like sound:

"Shiloh, Siloe, Siloah".

## IV. 2. oe.

*M. full*: Aroer *once*; soe'er *once*; soever *once*; whatsoever *once*; wheresoe'er *once*; whoever 4 *t.*; whomsoever *once*.

*M. short*: Sámoed *once*.

*Sh. full*: howsoe'er 6 *t.*; howsoever 3 *t.*; soe'er 6 *t.*; soever 4 *t.*; whatsoe'er 6 *t.*; whatsoever 7 *t.*; whence-soever *once*; whoc'er 8 *t.*; whoever 14 *t.*; whosoe'er 3 *t.*; whosoever *once*.

*Sh. short*: whensoe'er or whensoever *once* in *M.* for *M.* V, 1, 158.

In P.L. X, 696 there can be no doubt of the pronunciation of *Samod* as *Samod*, in two syllables. The modern form of the word is *Samoide*, *Samoied*, or *Samoyed*.

The syncopic pronunciation of *whosoever* as *whosever* is proved by the mode of printing in the following line:

Whos'euer greater fearde.

*H.* Then these O father yet agayne  
*Jasp. Heywood. Hercules Furens* (Repr. Spens. Soc. p. 40).

And in Ellis, *Pronouncing Vocabulary of the XVII. century* we find it stated that Cooper (1685) records the pronunciation *house:er* for *howsoever*.

## IV. 3. oi.

*M. short*: echoing 3 *t.*

Sh. *short*: *halloing once*; *Simois once*.

The "short" pronunciation of *Simois* is probably *Simos*. Jones says on p. 51 that *hemorrhoids* is pronounced *hemerods*, and the spellings *emerods*, *emerodes*, and *emrods* are common in the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries. The form *emerods* is found repeatedly in the Authorised Version, e. g. Deuter. 28, 27; 1 Sam. 5, 6. But the diphthongal pronunciation of *oi* as in *spoil*, i. e. the modern sound of *i* in *wine*, is also likely to have been in use.

The "short" pronunciation of the present participles *echoing* and *halloing* is brought about by syncopation of the *o*. Bysshe, *The Art of English Poetry*, 1702, says on p. 17 that "Gerunds of the Verbs in OW as *Following*, *Wallwing*, etc." admit of contraction. The forms just mentioned, owing to the intervening *w*, which, however, was probably not pronounced, do not belong to our subject, but the principle is the same. The Folio of Shakespeare prints *hollowing*, not *halloing*, and Milton always uses *to hallow* (four times in *Comus*), where modern editions print *halloo*.

#### IV. 4. oo.

No instances in Milton or Shakespeare. We register the collocation, because Jones says on p. 81 that *cooperate* and *coordinate* may be sounded *coperate* and *cordinate*.

#### IV. 5. ou.

M. *short*: *Alcinous 3 t.*

We incline to believe that *-ous* was in this case pronounced like the ending *-ous* in *amorous*, *virtuous*, etc.

#### V. 1. ua.

M. *full*: *insinuate once*; *situate once*; *situation once*.

M. *short*: *actual once*; *annual 4 t.*; *casual 3 t.*; *continual once*; *dividual twice*; *effectual twice*; *extenuate twice*; *fluctuate once*; *gradual twice*; *habitual once*; *individual 3 t.*; *ineffectual once*; *intellect-*

ual 4*t.*; Joshua *once*; mutual 12*t.*; perpetual 13*t.*; punctual *once*; sanctuary 5*t.*; sensual 3*t.*; sensualest *once*; sensuality *once*; sp(i)ritual 8*t.*; spiritual 3*t.*; unusual *twice*; usual *once*; virtual *twice*; visual 3*t.*

Sh. *full*: continuance *twice* in M. of V. I, 1, 125 and I H 4. IV, 3, 105; effectual 3*t.* in Shrew III, 1, 68, II H 6. III, 1, 41 and T.A. V, 3, 43 ('fectual); extenuate 3*t.*, *e. g.* Venus 1010; extenuation *once*; February *once*; insinuate 5*t.*, *e. g.* Venus 1012; insinuation *twice*; Mantua 12*t.*, *e. g.* R. & J. III, 3, 149; Padua 3*t.* in M. of V. IV, 1, 403, Shrew II, 1, 370, and III, 2, 136; perpetual 3*t.*, *e. g.* Lucr. 726; sanctuary *twice* in R 3. III, 1, 55 & 56; sensuality *once*; situation *twice*; valuation *twice*.

Sh. *short*: actual *once*; annual 5*t.*; casual *once*; casually *once*; casualty 3*t.*; commutual *once*; continual 10*t.*; continually *once*; continuance 5*t.*, *e. g.* Lucr. 1097; continue *twice*; Cophetua *twice*; effectual *once* in Gent. III, 1, 223; effectually *twice*; extenuate 3*t.*, *e. g.* M. for M. II, 1, 27; insinuate *twice*, *e. g.* R 2. IV, 1, 165; intellectual *once*; Mantua 7*t.*, *e. g.* R. & J. III, 3, 169; manual *twice*; mutual 17*t.*; mutually 5*t.*; Padua 21*t.*, *e. g.* M. of V. IV, 1, 119; perpetual 19*t.*, *e. g.* Lucr. 784; perpetually 3*t.*; sanctuarize *once*; sanctuary *twice*, *e. g.* R 3. III, 1, 28; sanctuar' 3*t.* in R 3. III, 1, 42, IV, 1, 94 and Cor. I, 10, 19; sensual 4*t.*; sp(i)ritual 6*t.*; sp(i)rituality *once*; uneffectual *once*; unusual 6*t.*; usual 6*t.*; usually *once*; victual 3*t.*

In the "short" pronunciation of the *-ua* ending *a* is apocopated, at least on p. 114 Jones gives the pronunciation *Mantu* for *Mantua*. As the name for an article of female dress, the word *mantua* still retains this dissyllabic pronunciation. *Padua* may be confidently supposed to have followed the same rule. Latimer's Sermons, 1549 (ed. Arber), have the spellings *Josua* and *Josue* interchangeably; considered in connection with the preceding words, the second of these spellings speaks strongly in favour of apocopic pronunciation. *Cophetua* only is less certain, because the Folio of Shakespeare has the spelling *Covitha*.

On p. 25 Jones says that the sound of *a* is written *ua*, "when it may be sounded *ua* as in *annual*, *casualty*, *continual*, *effectual*, *Electuary*, *February*, *guard*, *guardian*, *January*, *Language*, *mortuary*, *mutual*, *perpetual*, *promptuary*, *punctual*, *Sanctuary*, *sensual*, *sumptuary*, *Textuary*, *Vant-guard*, *Victuals*, *Virtual*, *Visual*, *usual*."

In *victuals* syncopation of the *u* is the invariable rule still in our days. We have not up to now found any instances in metre of the dissyllabic pronunciation of *ua* in the words *guard*, *guardian*, and *language*.

The syncopic pronunciation is aptly illustrated by the following rhyme:

For nothing else has Pow'r to settle  
Th' interests of Love, perpetual.

Hudibras, III Part, 1678, p. 53.

"Th'" is a misprint for *The* here.

We have come across the following syncopic spellings in print: *mutally* Wives Sc. XVII, 9, Q. S.; *vnusall* Lear, II, 3, 4, Q. & F.;

. . . . . which kepe you and youres continually strengthynge  
you with his sprete of comforte to his glory for ever Amen.  
*W. Roy & J. Barlowe*, Rede me and be nott wrothe, etc. (Repr. Arb. p. 25).

But here beholde the holy sancturie:

*Gascoigne* (Ed. Hazlitt, Vol. I, p. 277).

In Gower we have met with *spirital* and *vitaile*, the latter being nearer to the original old French form. "The word *victuals* is grossly misspelt, by a blind pedantry which ignores the French origin" (*Skeat*, Etym. Dict. i. v.).

Ch. Butler, Magd. Master of Arts, who brought out his "English Grammar, etc." in 1633, states in "An Index of woords Like and Unlike", that the two following words are pronounced the same:

"a Message nuncium a message messuagium".

These two words are also given in R. Hodges's list (Ellis, p. 1020), and by Owen Price, as cited by Ellis, p. 1024, in his list of words of like sound. This last list also includes "*annual*, *annals*". This might be supposed to point to dropping of the *s* in *annals*, but the *s* may be the printer's, the singular *annal* being rare already in the XVII century. Cooper (1685) also has "*message nuncium*, *message villa*".

#### V. 2. ue.

M. *full*: influence 10 *t.*, *e. g.* Christ's Nat. 71; Penueel *once*.

M. *short*: effluence *once*; influence 2 *t.*, in P.L. III, 118, and IX, 309; profluent *once*; statue *twice*.

Sh. *full*: influence 4 *t.*, *e. g.* Sonn. 78, 10; statue 4 *t.*, in II H 6. III, 2, 80, R 3. III, 7, 25, J.C. II, 2, 76 and III, 2, 192.

Sh. *short*: confluence *once*; influence 4 *t.*, *e. g.* Sonn. 15, 4; statue 16 *t.*, *e. g.* Venus 213.

Jones says on p. 46 that the sound *e* is written *ue*, "when it may be sounded *ue*, as in affluence, influence, re-fluent, etc."

The modern pronunciation of the word *statue* shows that the "short" form was brought about by apocopation. Owen Price's table (1668) of Words of Like Sound (Ellis, p. 1028) gives:

"stature, statute, statue".

The statement at the same time proves the non-pronunciation of the final consonant in the first two words. Confusion between these three words is of frequent occurrence in the old texts. This confusion is intentional in *Ado* III, 3, 85, F., *statues* for *statutes*; *statute* for *statue* is a printer's error in *Per.* II, Prol. 14, Q<sub>2</sub> and Q<sub>3</sub>; *statuer* for *statue* we have met elsewhere (Cf. W. Shak.: Prosody and Text, p. 18).

#### V. 3. ui.

M. *full*: fruition *twice*.

M. *short*: arguing *twice*; issuing 7 *t*.

Sh. *full*: fruition *once*.

Sh. *short*: arguing 3 *t*.; issuing 4 *t*.; rescuing *once*; valuing *once*.

Direct evidence for the syncopation of *u* in the *-uing* ending, we have not found, but the analogy of the other present participles (see pp. 181 and 189 ff.) puts it beyond reasonable doubt.

Since of the trisyllabic word *puissant*, now usually stressed on the first syllable *pu*, older orthoepists mention a pronunciation with the accent on the second syllable *is*, the question arises whether the latter pronunciation was at all admissible in XVII. century use. If so, the word would have to be discussed here. Now in metre Milton has the word *puissant* 5 times, and Shakespeare 10 times, and in all these cases the word is dissyllabic with the stress on the

first syllable. That it must have been the *i* that was syn-copated, so that *ui* was sounded as long *u*, is proved by the circumstance that Shakespeare has 4 times the word *puissance* as a trisyllable with the primary accent on the first syllable, so that in the three cases in which the same word occurs in Shakespearean metre as a dissyllable, the pronunciation must have been *pu'sance*.

An interesting analogue to the breaking up of the originally monosyllabic *ui* in *puissance*, is furnished by the word *bruin*, originally a Dutch word of one syllable.

#### V. 4. uou.

**M. full:** superfluous *once* in P.L. IV, 832; vacuous *once*.

**M. short:** ambiguous 4 *t.*; assiduous *once*; circumfluous *once*; conspicuous 8 *t.*; contemptuous 4 *t.*; contiguous *twice*; discontinuous *once*; impetuous 6 *t.*; incestuous *twice*; irriguous *once*; mellifluous *twice*; presumptuous 4 *t.*; presumptuously *once*; promiscuous *twice*; sinuous *once*; strenuous *once*; sumptuous *twice*; superfluous 4 *t.*, *e. g.* P.L. V, 325; tempestuous 3 *t.*; tortuous *once*; transpicuous *once*; tumultuous *twice*; unctuous *once*; unsuperfluous *once*; virtuous 13 *t.*; virtuous<sup>est</sup> *once*; voluptuous 3 *t.*

**Sh. full:** presumptuous *once* in III H 6. I, 1, 157; superfluous *once* in Lear II, 4, 268; virtuous 10 *t.* in Ado V, 1, 312, Shrew II, 1, 43 & 92, III H 6. III, 3, 245, IV, 6, 26 & 27, R 3. I, 2, 104, Tim. III, 2, 45, O. III, 3, 186, and Per. II, 5, 67.

**Sh. short:** ambiguous *once*; contemptuous *twice*; contemptuously *once*; impetuous *twice*; incestuous 4 *t.*; ingenuous 3 *t.*; perspicuous *once*; presumptuous

4 *t.*, *e. g.* A. W. I, 3, 204; sumptuous 3 *t.*;  
sumptuously *once*; superfluous 13 *t.*, *e. g.* H 5.  
IV, 2, 11; tempestuous *twice*; tumultuous 4 *t.*;  
unctuous *once*; virtuous 63 *t.*, *e. g.* Lucr. 252;  
virtuously 4 *t.*; voluptuousness *twice*.

Jones says on p. 88 that the sound of *ou* is written *uou*, "when it may be sounded *uou*s, as in *ambiguous, conspicuous, contemptuous, contiguous, ingenuous, perspicuous, presumptuous, promiscuous, strenuous, sumptuous, superfluous, tempestuous, virtuous*".

And directly after this he states, that the sound of *ous* is written *uou*s, "when it may be sounded *uou*s, as in *virtuous, u-uou, above*".

In strict logic, these two statements taken in connection with each other, would warrant the inference that in these words *final s* was only optionally pronounced. This is quite possible, but the point is outside our present subject.

The syncopic pronunciation with dropping of the first *u* in *uou* is aptly illustrated by the following rhyme:

I'll prove my self as close, and vertuous,  
As, your own Secretary, Albertus.<sup>1)</sup>

Hudibras, II Part, 1664, p. 32.

and by occasional phonetic spellings, *e. g.* *ingen(n)ous* in L.L.L. IV, 2, 80, Q. & F.

. . . , to comfort the desperate, to cut off the presumptous,  
to saue thine owne soule by thy sure faith, . . .

*J. Lyly, Euphues, 1579 (Repr. Arber, p. 113).*

*Tempestous* is found in Chaucer's *Troilus*, II, 5.

Some of the words above discussed, *e. g.* *incestuous, unctuous*, etc. are pretty frequently found in print with the spelling *incestious, unctious*, etc. The confusion that is here

---

<sup>1)</sup> Pronounce: Secretar' Albertus.

exemplified between *u* and *i*, also occurs between *e* and *i* in analogous positions, and is very naturally induced by the frequent practice either of dropping the sound of these letters in such cases, or of pronouncing them so indistinctly as to render them practically indistinguishable by the ear.

V. 5. uu.

Words containing this combination do not occur either in Milton or in Shakespeare, but for the sake of completeness we mention that Jones says on p. 115 that the sound of *u* is written *uu* "in *Carduus*, sounded *cardus*".

VI. 1. ya.

M. *short*: Libyan 3*t*.

Sh. *short*: Libya 4*t*.

These words, together with those in the sections following, are treated like those spelt with *i* instead of *y*. The spelling *Libian* is found in P.L. I, 355, and the Quartos as well as the Folio of Shakespeare always print the ending of the word *Libya* as *-bia*.

VI. 2. ye.

M. *full*: hyena *once*.

Sh. *full*: Syenna *once*.

Sh. *short*: lawyer 4*t*.

Of "*Boycer, Lawyer, Saucyer*", Jones registers only the trisyllabic pronunciation *law-i-er*. We have come across this pronunciation once or twice in Shakespeare's contemporaries. The "short" pronunciation is *law'er*, as may be seen, *inter alia*, from Levins's Manipulus Vocabulorum, where (col. 74) "A Lawyer", "A Mawer", "A Tawer" form a rhyming triplet of dissyllabic words. We have found the spelling *lawer* repeatedly in Lever's sermons, *e. g.*

. . . be thou gentleman in the contrey, be thou lawer, be  
you courtear, or what maner of man soeuer thou be, . . . .

*Th. Lever, Sermons, 1550 (Repr. Arber, p. 29).*

The spelling *lawer* also occurs on pp. 38 (twice), 50, and 63, whereas the form *lawyer* is found but once in these Sermons, viz. on p. 88. We mention this as a telling example in proof of our contention that in such cases it is not ordinary misprints that we have to do with, as seems to have been generally assumed with respect to nearly all those quotations of ours which we adduce as phonetic spellings.

As regards the "short" form of *bowyer*, compare:

Thus a shooter muste begyn not at the makynge of hys bowe lyke a bower, but at the bynge of hys bow lyke an Archere.

R. Ascham, *Toxophilus*, 1545 (R. A. p. 116).

#### VI. 3. yi.

M. *short*: carrying *once*; envying *twice*; glorying *once*; marrying *once*; pitying *twice*.

Sh. *full*: burying *once* in Per. III, 2, 72; levying *once* in A. & C. III, 6, 67; marrying *once* in Wives IV, 6, 50; miscarrying *once*; pitying *once* in H 8. II, 3, 53; tarrying *once* in M.N.D. V. 1, 149.

Sh. *short*: accomp(a)nying *once*; bandying *once*; burying *twice*, e. g. *Lucr.* 1810; carrying *once*; dallying *once*; discandying *once*; emptying 3*t.*; envying *twice*; levying *once* in J.C. IV, 1, 42; marrying 3*t.*, e. g. *R* 3. I, 1, 159; pitying 5*t.*, e. g. *Lucr.* 1747; studying *twice*; tarrying 3*t.*, e. g. *J.C.* V, 5, 30; varying 5*t.*

[We regret to say that in the first cast of the present paper we had overlooked these and the following present participles. Their insertion was an afterthought, and we may well have passed over a few of them.]

The "short" pronunciation is brought about by dropping the *y*, as is proved by the following spellings:

To which these carr'ings on did tend?

Hudibras, I Part, 1663, p. 114.

And threw my selfe amid the streame: which as I dallingly  
*Arth. Golding, Metamorph. 1587, p. 73.*

But than fro thens wythowten any hardnes or taryng  
they ascende vppe to the hey heuin . . . .

The Revelation to the Monk of Evesham, 1482 (Rep. Arber, p. 108).

. . . ther was no difficulte ther was no taryng yn her as-  
cendyng . . .

Id. *ibid.*

And as tochyng the taryng that y made yn thys vysyon . . .

Id. p. 110.

By some unpitting Pirat that is sack'd;

*Drayton, Heroic. Epistles (Repr. Spens. Soc. p. 334).*

The identical pronunciation of *marrying* and *marring* is proved, *inter alia* by the word-play in Wives I, 1, 25 & 26, and it often led the old printers astray. In the second Folio the word *marring* Wives I, 1, 26 is spelt *marrying*; in the seventh Quarto R 3. I, 1, 159 we have *marring* instead of *marrying*.

Of intrusive *y* before *-ing* we cite the following instances we have found in print:

. . . ., the feare of their enemies, the auoydyng of punish-  
ment, . . . .

*R. Ascham, Toxophilus, 1545 (Repr. Arber, p. 84).*

Lette euerie man do his owne busines, and folow his callyng.

*Hugh Latimer, Ploughers, 1548 (Repr. A. p. 29).*

And so to conclude wyth suche gamnyng<sup>1)</sup>, I thynke there  
is no vngraciousenes in all thys worlde, that carieth so far  
from god, as thys faulte doth.

*R. Ascham, Toxophilus 1545 (R. A. p. 57).*

. . . ., and shotying it selfe also (if it coulede speke) for  
your kyndnesse, wyll can you very moche thanke.

*Ibidem, p. 31.*

. . . .: for I my selfe do remembre that shotying in war is  
but smally praysed, . . . .

*Ibidem, p. 65.*

Cursed swerying, blasphemie of Christe.

*Ibidem, p. 56.*

<sup>1)</sup> *Gamning*, obsolete form of *gaming*.

## VI. 4. yo.

M. *short*: embryo *once*; embryon *twice*; Geryon *once*.

Sh. *short*: Halcyon *twice*; ronyon *once*; Sicyon 3*t*.

Since the great majority of these words also occur with the *io* spelling, they may be held to follow the rules for the *io* words.

## VII. 1. eia.

Sh. *full*: plébeian *twice* in Cor. V, 4, 39, and A. & C. IV, 12, 34.

Sh. *short*: plébeians *twice* in Cor. I, 9, 7, and T. A. I, 1, 231.

In view of the spelling *Plebeans*, which occurs a couple of times in the Folio, and also in the Quarto of Titus Andronicus, the dropping of the *ei* or the *e* in the "short" pronunciation is quite certain.

## VII. 2. eii.

Sh. *full*: plébeii *once*.

## VIII. 1. eyi.

Sh. *short*: journeying *once*; lacqueying *once*.

The line A. & C. I, 4, 46 is often cited to show the marvellous art of Shakespeare in making use of the extra syllable. This extra syllable, however, and all others, exist only in the imagination of long-suffering readers. The Folio, the only authoritative text of A. & C., has *lacking*, and not *lacqueying*.

## VIII. 2. eyo.

Sh. *full*: púrveyor *once*; súrveyor *once*.

The evidentiary material set forth in the preceding pages in our opinion goes to prove with absolute certitude that in Milton no more than in Shakespeare can there be question of synizetic pronunciation in any words in which the two

vowel-sounds adjoining each other are preceded by another consonant than one representing an *s*-sound.

In the case of a small minority of the said words — the words with preceding *s*-sound we reserve for separate discussion — we have to assume “short” pronunciation by means of apocopation; as regards the great majority of them, we have brought together a mass of irrefragable evidence that puts syncopic shortening in their case beyond all reasonable doubt.

In a great number of these words the old syncopic shortening has been replaced by the synizetic shortening of modern pronunciation. According to Ellis, John Wallis in his *Grammatica Lingvæ Anglicanae* (first edition: Oxoniæ, 1653)<sup>1)</sup> was the first to make mention of this synizetic pronunciation, but only for the word *Christian*, and for no other word. On turning to Wallis’s book, however, we have not found the slightest reference in it to a synizetic pronunciation of the word *Christian*. Here, as in so many other cases, Ellis’s statements turn out to be misleading. On p. 61 of the *Editio Sexta* (Londini et Lipsiæ MDCCLXV), Wallis tells his readers that the word *Christian* is pronounced “per *ɪ*<sup>2)</sup> exile seu breve”. By this *ɪ* Wallis means the vowel-sound in *bit*, *will*, etc. (p. 65). And he does not refer to the second *i* in *Christian*, which he leaves quite undiscussed, but what he means is, that the first *i* in *Christian* is short, in contradistinction to the *i* in *Christ*, which he states to be long.

The next mention in order of time, of synizetic pronunciation is by Ellis assigned to Owen Price (1668), and

---

<sup>1)</sup> In the British Museum copy of the *editio princeps* the 3 of 1653 is crossed out, and 1652 written in the margin.

<sup>2)</sup> The 1653 edition reads *e*, an evident misprint.

is concerned with the word *soldier*. This statement in Ellis, together with his references to Cooper and Miede, we have been unable to verify.

After Owen Price comes Cooper in 1685 with the words *bullion*, *celestial*, and in similar words *-sti* = *-sty*, *collier*, and similar words, *companion*, *courteous*, *onion*, and similar words.

In 1688 follows Miede with *soldier*.

And in 1701, as we have already said, we have Jones with only the words *Indian* and *soldier* and no others, while on the other hand this close observer of the usage of his day, in the case of the word *Indian* also registers its trisyllabic pronunciation, and its pronunciation by dropping the second *i*.

Besides, still in 1678, in the III. Part of Hudibras, we get evidence of the syncopic pronunciation of the word *soldier*, in three rhymes, of which we have cited one on p. 159.

From this we have a right to conclude with a high degree of certitude that — as regards such words as have no *s*-sound preceding the two vowel-sounds — the synizetic pronunciation has gradually arisen at the close of the seventeenth century.

The English of the New England States of the American Union is an independent direct continuation of the English of the seventeenth century. We need hardly be astonished, therefore, though we cannot fail to be interested, to find that in the United States there may be heard even in our day a very large number of word-forms absolutely identical with those that Shakespeare and Milton must have made use of. Of the words which we have treated of in the preceding pages, we have found the following syncopic shortenings exemplified in J. R. Lowell's well-known Biglow Papers

(1846—1866) in the Yankee dialect, concerning his rendering of which Lowell expressly says: "As regards the provincialisms [*i. e.* deviations from the educated speech of our day] to be met with in this volume, I may say that the reader will not find one which is not (as I believe) either native or imported with the early settlers, nor one which I have not, with my own ears, heard in familiar use":

*ath'ism, curus & cur'ous, Dannil, experunce, Gabr'el, illustrious, intellectle, Ishmel, materil, notorious, pecooler, prem'um, promiscu'sly, speritoolism, rarus & var'ous, victor'ous.*

Of course, in England too, these old forms survive in various dialects.

A cursory search through the published parts of Prof. Wright's Dialect Dictionary for the purposes of the present paper, has yielded the following results as regards the traces of the older pronunciation on this point still extant in English dialects: *bustin* for *bustion*, *boostis* for *bustious*, *carrin & carron & carrun & karrin & careyn* for *carrion*, *casalty & cas'alty & caselty, etc.* for *casualty*, *champion*, "a variant of lit. E. champaign" (!), *Christen & Crissen & kessen & kirssen & Christ'an, etc.* for *Christian*, *clarent* and *clarient*, *curous* for *curious*, *gennal* for *genial*, *grievious* for *grievous*. The very forms used by Shakespeare and Milton!

In Part V of Ellis, *E. E. Pronunciation*, which treats of modern dialectal pronunciation, we hoped to find plenty of material that might yield important results for our present investigation. But we were sadly disappointed. Of all the words we are now treating of, the only one fully discussed by Ellis is the word *onion*. Yet, scanty as the catch was, as regards this word the result of our wading through Ellis's ponderous dialect volume was eminently satisfactory for our present purpose.

From John o' Groats' to Land's End, e'en through the length and breadth of the land, the syncopic pronunciation of *onion* with dropped *i* continues to be heard from the lips of rustic speakers, as Ellis tells us on pp. 58, 60, 68, 110, 116, 120, 128, 145, 162, 194, 211, 746, 751, 763, and 785.

And, what is no less interesting, also the trisyllabic pronunciation of *onion* is vigorously alive at the present time, as we learn on pp. 165, 187, 328, 483, 537, 623, 633, and 672.

On p. 271, in an account of Forby's "East eastern" pronunciation, Ellis cites such forms as: *christan*, *curoosity*, *curous*, *ingenous*, *ruffan*, *tedous*, *acquese* (= acquiesce), and *permiscous*; together with *disposial*, *stupenduous*, and *tremenduous*.

We pass over a couple of isolated instances of syncopic pronunciation registered by Ellis, but just make room for his reference on p. 713 of Part V to Dr. Murray's *Dialects of the Southern Counties of Scotland*, p. 135, where the full pronunciation of *communion* is mentioned, and also of other words, in which, however, *io* is preceded by an *s*-sound.

Although we might easily multiply instances from various more or less obscure books on pronunciation, vulgar or dialectal, we venture to think that what we have advanced up to now fully proves that the old syncopic pronunciation, as well as the old "full" pronunciation, is still extant, whatever pains the schoolmaster for many years past may have taken to uproot them.

The question now presents itself, what can have been the reason of the synizetic pronunciation having ousted the syncopic one in educated use?

No doubt it was the schoolmaster who was at the bottom

of it all. At the close of the seventeenth century the school-master began to influence strata of the community that had up to then been impervious to his teaching, and it was at this very period that, as we have seen, the Holofernes<sup>1)</sup> spirit of literalism began to become rampant also in schools destined for the mass of the people. The natural desire to get rid of what was needless, on one hand, and the school-master's mandate to give every written letter its due, on the other, may well have led to the compromise which we know as the synizetic pronunciation.

In the case of the words in which the two vowel-sounds adjoining each other are preceded by an *s*-sound, we find ourselves arrested by a difficulty. Up to now we have in the present paper designated as "synizetic pronunciation" the modern sound of *sh* (or *zh*) given to the letters *-ce-*, *-ci-*, *-si-*, *-ti-*, *-(k)si-*, — not, indeed, because this sound is synizetic in the strict sense of the term, but because it is generally assumed and taken for granted that the *sh*-sound has arisen from the *purely* synizetic pronunciation *sy* [with *y* consonant], of which it is considered to be merely an ulterior development. In other words: it is assumed that, taking as an example the word *nation*, its pronunciation was *na-si-on* in the first stage, *na-syon* in the second, and has become *na-shon* in the third or modern stage.

Against this it must be observed, that up to now the pronunciation *na-syon* of the second stage of development

---

<sup>1)</sup> Cf. Love's Labour's Lost, V, 1, 19—27: [Holofernes *log.*] I abhor such fanatical phantasimes, such insociable and point-devise companions; such rackers of orthography, as to speak *dout*, fine, when he should say *doubt*; *det.* when he should pronounce *debt*, — d, e, b, t, not d, e, t: he clepeth a calf, *cauf*; half, *hauf*; neighbour *vocatur nebur*; neigh abbreviated *ne*. This is abhominable, — which he would call *abbominable*:

must be looked upon as purely hypothetical. But of greater weight than the absence of evidence on this point, are the results of our investigation as set forth in the preceding pages. They go to prove that the *na-shon* pronunciation was explicitly recognised by various orthoepists at the close of the seventeenth century, nay, that, certainly at least in the case of some words, it had been known a century earlier already. We have also found on indubitable evidence, that in the seventeenth century and before it, words in which there was no anterior *s*-sound, were shortened by syncopation or apocopation, but in no case by synizesis. Hence, so far as the words with a preceding *s*-sound are concerned, the purely synizetic pronunciation *sy* (with *y* consonant), which as we have seen has not arisen before the end of the seventeenth century at the earliest, cannot possibly be made to do duty as an hypothetical XV, XVI, or XVII century second stage of phonetic development.

Still, the solution of the difficulty is easy enough. It was not the *-si-* sound that underwent modification in the course of time, but it is the *s* that has changed its sound. The sound of the *s* must of old have been vacillating in words taken from the French: at the end of a word or syllable it often underwent palatalisation i. e. passed into the *sh*-sound.

This is proved by the historic development of the form of various words, of which we instance the following: *cash* from the French *casse*; *cash(ier)* from the French *casser*; *cushion* from O. Fr. *coissin*, Mod. Fr. *coussin*; *fashion* in Chaucer *fasoun* only; the numerous verbs in *-ish*, such as *to finish*, *to nourish*, *to punish*, all derive from O. Fr. stems in *-iss-*, e. g. *finiss-*, base of *finissant*; some of these verbs have Middle English forms with *s* for the modern *sh*: in

Chaucer we find both *norissing* and *norissching*; in Chaucer's *Legende of Good Women, Lucrece*:

Teeres ful of hevytee (honestee?)  
Embelysshed hire wifely chastitee.

two manuscripts read *embelised*, *enbelised*; the N. E. Dict. i. v. *embellish* cites from the romance of Partonope 5981 [ab. 1440]: Wyth beaute . . . nature Wold so embelyce ony oo creature; and i. v. *flourish*, various XIV, XV, and even XVI century passages — the last being Scottish —, containing the forms *florist* (= flourished), *florisand* (= flourishing), *flurisit* (Lyndesay 1530), etc.

The modern *anguish*, from the French *angoisse*, is found spelt *anguys* in Pricke of Conscience [1340] 2240, *anguysse* in Rob. of Glouc. [ab. 1298], p. 177, and *anguise* in *Ancren Riwele* [ab. 1230], p. 178 (Skeat); and it long retained its final consonant optionally unpalatalised. As late as 1482 we find in print:

. . . . . was in grete anguys and sorowe of peynys and tormentys.

The Revelation to the Monk of Evesham (Repr. Arber, p. 43).

The modern English name *Flushing* of the Dutch seaport is based on the native name *Vlissingen*. We find the medial *ss* palatalised in Ben Jonson:

This rapier, sir, has trauail'd by my side, sir, the best part of *France* and the low *Countrey*: I haue seene *Vlissing*, *Brill*, and the *Haghe*, with this rapier, sir, in my lord of *Leysters* time:

Every Man out of his Humour, F. 1616, p. 127.

Modern *launch* is based on Middle English *launcen*, Fr. *lancer*. Skeat quotes from the Promptorium Parvulorum (1440): "*Lawncyn*, *lawnchyn*, or styng with a spere or blode-ryne, lanceo"; and even in 1580 we find John Lyly writing

. . . . , who hoyseth vp all his sayles, and hath no winde, and launceth out his ship, and hath no water.

Euphues and his England (Repr. Arber, p. 317).

The O. and Mod. Fr. *paroissien* figures in Chaucer and Langland as *parisshen*, and is found in the Revelation to the Monk of Evesh. (Repr. Arber, p. 49) under the form *pareshon*, the modern form being *parishioner*, with an unnecessary suffix. John Selden still spells it without the second *i*:

Those Ministers that keep the Parishoners from it,  
Table Talk, 1689 (Repr. Arber, p. 105).

Compare also *Swycher* for *Switzer* in

An other woulde haue the fauoure of the Swychers wonne  
with money.

Th. More's Utopia Englished, 1556 (R. A. p. 56).

In the old editions of Shakespeare's works the spellings *goship* in R. & J. II, 1, 11, Q. & F., and *rushling* in Wives II, 2, 68 F. point to palatalisation of the *s*. We also remember to have met with a few *s:sh* rhymes in Shakespeare's contemporaries, which we now greatly regret to have omitted to keep notes of, because their significance escaped us at the time. But on turning over the volumes of Ellis, that past-master of fault-finding as regards the rhymes of the old poets, we are fortunate enough directly to light on the rhyme *refresh: redress* in Pass. Pilgrim XIII, 8 & 10.<sup>1)</sup>

We subjoin the following utterances, culled from the works of the old writers on pronunciation.

---

<sup>1)</sup> Since writing the above we have recovered two *s:sh* rhymes which we had formerly noticed in Ben Jonson:

It should bee my wishing  
That I might dye, kissing.

*Ben Jonson*, Folio 1616, p. 227.

Welcome, monarch of this Isle,  
Europes enuie, and her merror;  
Great in each part of thy stile:  
Englands wish, and Scotlands blisse,  
Both France, and Irelands terror.

*Ben Jonson*, Folio 1616, p. 879 [The Penates].

Internal rhyme in the fourth line — in this case *wish: bliss* — occurs in each of the seven other stanzas of this poem.

In his list of "words which are so near alike in sound as that they are sometimes taken one for another", R. Hodges mentions *vist* & *risht* (Ellis, p. 1022).

In Owen Price's "Table of Words of like Sound" are found the following collocations (Ellis, pp. 1024—1028):

*ass*, *ashes* any fuel burnt to dust, *ash* a tree, *ask*<sup>1)</sup> to enquire.

*complice* a partaker, *accomplish*<sup>2)</sup>.

*jewes*, *Jewish*<sup>3)</sup>, *juice*.

*launce*, to cut off dead, rotten flesh, *lanch* to put out a ship from harbour.

*march* to go as soldiers go together, *Mars*, *marsh* a moor.

*nesh* tender, effeminate. *neece* ones sister's, or brother's daughter, *nice*, curious, delicate.

*plush*, [*over-*] *plus*, [*non-*] *plus*.

*quench*, *quince*.

*shave*, *sheave* as of corn, *sheathe*, *shive* a slice of bread, *cieve* that we winnow corn with.

*Shiloh*, *Siloe*, *Siloah*.

*shut*, *soot*.

*thrush*, *thrust*<sup>4)</sup>.

Cooper mentions among his "Voces quæ eandem habent pronounciationem" (Ellis, p. 1030):

*lease* charta redemptionis, *leash* ternio canum.

In Jones (p. 101) we find that *s* was usually pronounced as *sh* in the following words: *assume*, *assure*, *assurance*, *ensure*, *consume*, *desume*, *ensue*, *ensure*, *fissure*, *issue*, *leisure*, *measure*, *pleasure*, *pressure*, *pursue*, *pursuer*, *pursuit*, *sue*, *suet*, *sugar*, *suit*, *sure*, *sute*, *tissue*, and *treasure*.

If it should be supposed, as is actually done by many writers on phonetics, that in words in which *s* is followed by long *u*, the *i* that constitutes the first element in the modern diphthong *u*, has brought about the *sh* pronunciation,

<sup>1)</sup> "Polite E. makes *asked* into (*aast*)". Sweet, Hist. of Engl. Sounds, 1888, p. 28.

<sup>2)</sup> Owen Price of course means the apheetised form '*complish*'.

<sup>3)</sup> The syncopated form *Jew'sh* is of course meant.

<sup>4)</sup> Dropping of the final *t*.

we must observe against this that in such words the *sh* pronunciation is probably older than the modern diphthongal pronunciation of long *u*, while at the same time it seems utterly out of the question that in such words as *censure*, *fissure*, *leisure* the unstressed *u* should ever have been pronounced as the modern diphthong *u*. Our examples moreover prove that various final *s*'s have also got palatalised without any aid from a following vowel. And finally, there are hundreds of words in modern English, in which the *s*-sound becomes palatalised, while at the same time the vowel following it remains intact, and together with the *sh* (or *zh*) sound continues to constitute a syllable by itself, so that the modification or disappearance of the vowel-sound cannot possibly have brought about the *sh* sound. As examples of such words we cite: *acacia*, *Acacian*, *Asian*, *Asiatic*, *Elysian*, *Elysium*, *nausea*, *nauseant*, *nauseate*, *nuncio*, *prescience*, the numerous verbs in *-ciate* and *-tiate*, such as *associate* and *satiate*, together with a large number of Latin and Greek proper names like *Abantia*, *Abercius*, *Actium*, *Alsius*, *Amarynceus*, *Anaxias*, *Asiagenes*, *Aspasia*, *Arusianus*, *Austesion*, *Bargusii*, *Brixia*, *Cassiodorus*, *Susiana*, *Tiresias*, et tutti quanti.

From all this we have a right to conclude that the modern so-called synizetic "short" pronunciation of the words in which such combinations as *-io-*, *-ia*, etc. are preceded by an *s* or *z* sound, is purely syncopic, and must be placed in a line with the modern pronunciation of the word *marriage*.

And this pronunciation was current already in Shakespeare's time. This admits of direct proof in the case of a few words; for the word *martial*, for instance, it is proved by the frequent interchanges with *marshal* that occur everywhere in the old texts. As regards the word *passion*, the

pronunciation *pash(i)on* is put beyond doubt, 1<sup>o</sup> by the rhyme with *fashion*, *Lucr.* 1317 & 1319, *Sonn.* 20, 2 & 4, *L.L.L.* IV, 3, 139 & 140, the said rhyme occurring also a few times in *Spenser*, *Jonson*, etc.; and 2<sup>o</sup> by the spelling of the apocopated form in the old text of *Roister Doister*:

Nay for the paishe of God, let me now treate peace,

*N. Udal*, *Roister Doister*, ab. 1550 (Repr. Arber, p. 65).

Backe for the pashe of God, backe sirs, backe againe.

*Ibidem*, p. 73.

Away for the pashe of our sweete Lord Jesus Christ.

*Ibidem*, p. 78.

It is precisely for such newly evolved word-forms, of which no conventional spelling has been handed down, that writers and printers are naturally led to make use of some mode of phonetic transcription of the sounds as they hear them. Hence also the spelling *lushious*, which is found not only in *M.N.D.* II, 1, 251, Q. — the Folio has *luscious* — but also in several other writers. Jones says that this word is always spelt with *sh*. This *lushious* can hardly be anything else than the aphetised form of *delicious*, which aphetised form printers (or writers) probably failed to identify. We have the apocopated form *lush* in *Tp.* II, 1, 52, F.

But of much more far-reaching import than the evidence in the case of a few isolated words, is the following very significant passage, which Ellis on pp. 915 & 916 cites from a black-letter book, probably of the year 1602, entitled "Certaine grammar questions for the exercise of young Schollars in the learning of the Accidence." To the question what mistakes should be avoided, answer Nr. 7 runs thus:

"Abusing of letters. as *v* for *f*. *vat* for *fat*. *z* for *s* as *muza* for *musa*. *sh* for *ci*. as *fasho* for *facio* *dosham* for *doceam* *fælishum* for *felicium* and such like".

Now it goes without saying that an English boy who was being grounded in Latin, would never think of sounding

*ci* as *sh* in that language, if he was not accustomed to do so in his mother-tongue. The argument is so cogent, that Ellis, who for the period 1550—1650 recognises only the “full” pronunciation of *passion* and all similar words, and who actually cites such rhymes as *passion: fashion* in proof of his contention that Shakespeare and Spenser are often guilty of imperfect rhymes — that Ellis, I say, is forced to admit on p. 916 that *sh* for *si* was “most probably an unrecognized English sound at the close of the XVIth century.”

From this we see that Ellis has a knack of pooh-poohing positive evidence that does not fit in with his system. This “unrecognised sound” is not so much as alluded to in the further progress of Ellis’s work, and in his phonetic transcriptions he figures all the words that here concern us, in “full” pronunciation, as he says in accordance with Salesbury’s, Bullokar’s, and Gil’s practice in such cases (see Ellis, pp. 214 & 215).

But from Gil, for one, Ellis might have learnt very different things. On p. 132 of *Logonomia Anglica*, Ed. 1619, we read:

“Syllaba de binis confecta Synæresis extat.

Usitatissimus est hic metaplasmus in verbalibus passivis in *ed*; ut, *luv’d*, pro *lued*, & ubique alias; ut, *ev’ry*, pro *everj*; *habitation*, *whatsoever*, *okasion*, trissyllabis”<sup>1)</sup>.

---

<sup>1)</sup> There is a certain piquancy in the circumstance that Ellis also gives this quotation on p. 937 of his book, with a note in which he intimates that Gil probably means what we call the *purely* synizetic pronunciation of *occasion*. If Ellis thinks so, why does he only admit the “full” pronunciation? Of *whatsoever* he says that Gil probably means the pronunciation *whatsever*, but that this pronunciation “is quite conjectural, as there is no authority for it”. See *ante*, p. 180. Of the word *habitation*, Ellis says nothing.

Gil explicitly says here that the last three words are usually (*usitatissimus est!*) pronounced in three syllables, and the context in which he says it, leaves not the least doubt that in these three words we have to assume syn-copation, just as in the case of *loved* and *every*. Nor can it be in the least doubtful to the reader who has given us his attention up to this point, that Gil means the pronun-ciations *hab'tat'on* [with the second t = s], *whats'ever*, and *occas'on*. Compare with this the printed form *occcayson* in the two passages from Ralph Robynson's translation of Thomas More's *Utopia* (1551), cited *ante*, p. 168.

If now on the basis of our preceding investigation we try to ascertain, whether in Milton and Shakespeare the *-ion* ending is as a rule actually shortened — and to this and the like questions the foregoing pages afford full answers — we undoubtedly find that such shortening "*usitatissimus est*".

For in P.L. and P.R. the "full" pronunciation of the *-ion* ending, whatever consonant may precede it, does not occur a single time. By way of exception only, the "full" pronunciation still occurs in Milton's early poems. But even in Shakespeare the "full" pronunciation of the *-ion* ending is exceptional in two directions. In the first place it is far rarer than the "short" pronunciation, and secondly, in the cases in which it is actually met with, its occurrence is almost invariably confined to the end of the verse-line.

From this we have every right to conclude that at the beginning of the seventeenth century this "full" pronunciation had practically disappeared, or at all events was dying out, in the spoken language, though it continued to eke out a sort of artificial life in the well-known conservatism of the

poets, who are apt to cling to the models left by the great masters who have preceded them.

If our investigation has led us to the conclusion that in Shakespeare's time the pronunciation of a word like *nation* was *na-shon*, and *na-shi-on*, it must at the same time be admitted on the strength of the unstable sound of the *s*, that also the pronunciations *na-son* and *na-si-on* were in use.

For the *na-son* pronunciation we have evidence in such rhymes as *lessen: confession*, and for the *na-si-on* pronunciation we have an analogue in Jones's statement that words like *assume* are *COMMONLY* pronounced with *sh*, from which it must of course be inferred that also the pronunciation with pure (unpalatalised) *s* was admissible. We strongly incline to a belief that it was precisely the pronunciation of pure *s* that, in certain circles to which the schoolmaster is likely to have given the tone, was looked upon as the better, in fact as *the* pronunciation. And this fully explains why Salesbury, Bullokar, and Gil are silent about the *sh* pronunciation. In point of fact, this way of looking at the subject is strongly corroborated by Cooper, who admits *shure* and *shugar* "*facilitatis causa*", although he places such words immediately after his "*vitanda barbara dialectus*" (Ellis, p. 215).

The form *rushling* for *rustling* would also seem to be meant as characteristic of vulgarity in speech in the Shakespearean passage in which it occurs.

That two modes of pronunciation contending for the mastery, should either temporarily or permanently meet with different success in different words, is after all only what might *a priori* be expected. Such is life also in the world of words!

In conclusion, we would lay special stress on one point more. The inferences to be drawn from rhymes, from the

